

A4280

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 3, 1965

role in the maritime industry. But so long as the Government is involved—so long, for instance, as the Government is called upon to pay 72 cents or more of every dollar in wages aboard subsidized ships—the voice of the Government must and will be heard.

Now, I think we can all agree that neither higher subsidies nor higher rates could, by themselves, enhance the fortunes of the merchant marine. Much more is required. As President Johnson said in exhorting us to achieve progress in our maritime affairs: "To do so will require much more than the answer of just money alone. So in all the fields of transportation, our future progress depends upon the willingness of many different groups and interests to cooperate in a manner to which they are not always accustomed."

Only with this kind of cooperation will the national interest be served.

Only then can each of us concerned with the standing of our merchant fleet be able to say he has done his utmost to shake off the effects of neglect.

As men directly concerned, as officers of the U.S. merchant fleet, you will bear high responsibilities. In your hands will be the security of your ship, your crew, your passengers, and the million of dollars in cargo that you carry. These are life-and-death responsibilities assumed by few other Americans. But your commitment does not end on the bridge or in the engine room. I urge you to view your duties as far more than an exercise of professional skills. View them in the perspective of national needs and national purposes.

For only with that perspective can we truly restore America to its proper place in the high seas.

Thank you, good sailing, and godspeed.

For the Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr.
A Soldier's View of the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention a letter written to the editor of the Richmond Va., Times-Dispatch, some weeks ago, which I should like to share with other Members of this House.

It presents with great energy and conviction, I believe, the factors which are motivating our service personnel to dedicated investment of their skills and courage in a conflict of many frustrations.

The letter follows:

MESSAGE FROM A SOLDIER IN VIETNAM**SOME ADVICE TO THOSE WHO OPPOSE THE WAR**

I'm writing this not because of the lack of work—quite the contrary—but with the sincere hope you'll pass on our feelings here on the ground with the people living and dying in South Vietnam.

Everyone is aware that it has long been the policy of military men to do the bidding of the American people and the Commander in Chief at any cost, as history clearly shows from the crack of the Liberty Bell to the present. The U.S. military power in South Vietnam is not a clandestine organization, but the direct representative of America and all the believers of democracy have ever stood for since our birth.

To the bearded sit-down "End the killing" and "No more napalm" mob without the common decency to discontinue a demon-

stration while a chief of state is visiting the "majority elect" President of the United States of America, we cannot figure. We know any true lover of peace, let them understand, would trade all them for one Captain Hackley, of Roanoke, my good friend (killed in action in South Vietnam) in order to return him to duty and family.

To the haters of non-lethal (clearly defined in Webster) chemical agents, such as tear and vomiting gas, which is self explanatory, doing what the names imply, and white phosphate, used in screening and marking. I've enclosed a picture of a bus. The bus was filled with women and children and an incendiary round fired from a Chinese rocket launcher triggered the ambush in which Sgt. Jerry Rose of Huntington, W. Va., left forever a wife of only 9 months and family.

To you "Mothers of Peace," or whatever you call yourselves, and the believers of only the United States are aggressors in what you call a civil war in Vietnam, there was no regard for the civilians in the bus. This attack in the central highlands of the south was initiated by a hard core line unit of North Vietnamese regulars.

To the providers of medical aid for the Vietcong, the American soldier here really has nothing but pity for you because of how misled and uninformed you are. For your convenience, I've enclosed a picture of a young mother killed by small arms fire from Vietcong weapons and her baby which survived through a night alone before she was picked up by what you call downrangers American soldiers and taken to Pleiku. We are very happy to say the baby is much alive today, but without a family. This medical aid they wish to render, we cannot believe here in South Vietnam would be put to its best advantage by troops that would murder a mother and run away in the night leaving a baby to feed on a dead breast.

To all of the minority groups, as you return home tonight from your banner waving, sit-downs, protesting, and all the other pitiful demonstrating you have done today, as you retire in front of your TV's with coffee and family in your secure homes, I pray you'll take a couple of minutes to think. We are sure you'll say thanks for, above all, our God, health, country; President Johnson for carrying the weight of world problems and your petty grievances on his shoulders while you sleep; a powerful military of which over 400 already with such strong convictions have died in Vietnam, and for democracy whereby tomorrow you may return to your demonstrations.

We here in Vietnam will pray for the safety of our families and you, hoping that you, your children, and our sons will never see southeast Asia under any conditions other than peace, and we will remain forever if necessary to fulfill this goal—at any cost.

CHARLIE C. SCEARCE, Jr.,
5th Special Forces, Vietnam.
DON MANG YANE,
South Vietnam.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Sergeant Scarce is the son of Mrs Emily Scarce of Richmond.)

Some Queries**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Loyal Meek, formerly on the staff of Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa, did not

leave his keen perception of our Nation's problems behind him when he left Washington to become the editorial writer on national affairs for the Milwaukee Sentinel. In a recent editorial, he has pinpointed our basic inconsistency in prosecuting the war in Vietnam. I commend Mr. Meek's penetrating queries to the thoughts of my colleagues:

SOME QUERIES

America's commitment to the war in Vietnam is sharply and ominously escalated by President Johnson's decision to double the draft call.

This must be done, Mr. Johnson tells the Nation. Whether the Nation is convinced of the necessity is by no means certain.

The President has endeavored to persuade the people that the United States must make the stand against aggression in Vietnam and that he and his advisers are doing everything that can be done.

Americans, with the exception of a few on the wild left, generally agree that Communist aggression must be stopped. But serious doubts remain whether the United States is doing all that can and should be done to halt the spread of the Red evil. Particularly, the question remains whether the United States has done everything it can short of taking the drastic step of expending more and more of "the flower of our youth" in those remote jungles.

For example, has the United States done enough to choke off the supplying of the North Vietnam war machine by sea?

According to unclassified figures available through Defense Department sources, 401 ships flying the flags of free world nations called at North Vietnam ports during 1964.

Disclosure has slowed down this traffic. Still, through June of this year, 74 free world ships visited ports of North Vietnam.

Representative CHAMBERLAIN, Republican, of Michigan, has pointed out that since World War II, the United States has given almost \$41 billion in aid to the countries that have been carrying on this trade.

Even more astounding, he says, is the fact that the foreign aid authorization bill for the coming fiscal year proposes to give aid to six of the countries whose ships have been carrying cargoes to North Vietnam during the first half of this year.

Before American young men are conscripted to risk their lives in Vietnam, at poverty level wages at that, shouldn't the United States forthwith stop putting money into the hands that are feeding the enemy?

Also, while we are bombing North Vietnam, why do we spare the harbors through which are passing thousands of tons of supplies necessary to sustain the Communist fighting forces?

Instead of listening to how grievous a decision it is to send young men off to war, we would like to hear the answers to these questions.

Special Aloha Is Given Military on Hawaii Stopovers**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a bit of Hawaiian aloha and hospitality is once more being offered servicemen and their dependents who are in Hawaii during

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4279

ing the bow knife through the whitecaps. To my mind, man's sense of mastery over the elements cannot be equaled in any domain as at sea. So in addition to my best wishes, my heart is with you newly licensed officers today.

I don't need to discuss with you the purpose of the merchant fleet in war and peace. Neither must I expound the history of our country's oldest industry and the maritime tradition that is engraved in our national character. Nor is it necessary to elaborate on the exciting challenges that lie in your future.

You have been studying these things for 4 years, and if those years at this fine Academy had not been productive you would not be members of the class of 1965.

In the light of the maritime situation, however, I do want to reassert the Nation's interest in a strong, reliable merchant marine—and to emphasize the need for putting the national interest first.

Events in southeast Asia remind us dramatically of how indispensable it is to have a merchant fleet ready and able.

It is in time of peril that the sharpest focus is on our merchant marine. National survival has often depended upon our capability to move vast amounts of men and materiel to faraway places where freedom is challenged.

We have seen this urgency demonstrated forcefully within the memory of many of us here today, in the two World Wars, in Korea—and now in Vietnam. In that distant but vital area of southeast Asia, the United States is fulfilling its commitment to protect the right of people to live in liberty and dignity, free from subversion and naked aggression.

All of us are involved in the commitment.

The Maritime Administration already is reactivating ships from the National Defense Reserve fleets, at the call of the Military Sea Transportation Service. MSTTS is chartering private vessels to supply our forces in Vietnam. The flow of essential materiel must and will go on.

And the requirements of Vietnam could very well determine your initial billets. So this is a crucial situation of distinct personal meaning to all of you.

But it shouldn't be necessary to cite crises in order to underscore the national interest in a healthy merchant marine. The vital, continuing function of the maritime industry is to transport people and products in intercontinental and coastal commerce. By all standards, this is a major industry.

By itself, the maritime industry accounts for \$1.5 billion of our gross national product. It pays \$75 million in Federal and State taxes. It employs 100,000 workers, who themselves pay \$80 million in income taxes.

Moreover, the merchant marine is an essential element of the transportation complex which absorbs nearly 20 percent of the spending which goes into our total output of goods and services. In 1964 this added up to \$120 billion, an amount substantially greater than the Federal budget.

This figure alone indicates just how much the cost of transportation affects the cost of everything we buy and just about everything we do. And that is why the Commerce Department is giving such high priority to transportation research. We want to improve the Nation's huge transportation system—and this includes the merchant fleet—in order to achieve significant economies in time, money, and efficiency. When we do so, we will be able to pour additional resources into a steadily growing economy and thus raise the American living standards higher.

A strong, competitive merchant marine also serves the national interest by helping to overcome the deficit in our international balance of payments, which in the last several years grew to serious proportions.

As a national concern, the balance of payments cannot be overstressed. The dollar must and will be maintained at full value and full strength.

Trade flows on confidence in the dollar, and trade is as essential to our domestic economy as it is to the world economy. Nearly 3½ million American workers owe their livelihood to exports. The role of the merchant fleet in world trade is obvious. And its direct benefit to our payments position is substantial. The U.S.-flag fleet conserves millions in dollar exchange every year.

And conserve we must—in every channel of business, banking, and commerce—for there must never be a doubt about the dollar. It is essential that we alleviate our payments deficit in order to maintain the strength of the dollar and curtail the drain in our gold.

Let's state the case unequivocally: the strength of our national economy and our defense posture rest squarely upon the strength of the dollar. In solving our balance-of-payments problem a healthy U.S. merchant marine can make substantial contributions.

We are making headway in easing the strains on the dollar. As you know, President Johnson developed a program of voluntary cooperation among business and banking executives to bring our international accounts into balance. Businessmen have voluntarily exercised restraint on the investment of dollars abroad, stepped up exports and taken other steps to improve their individual balance-of-payments ledgers. The results so far are promising. But parenthetically, I want to express regret that American traders who voluntarily committed themselves to a key aspect of the President's program have been thrown off stride by the shipping tieup. They are the ones who agreed to use U.S. vessels to keep their transportation dollars at home—and who were compelled to use foreign bottoms instead, or find their cargoes immobilized in strike-bound ships.

The expansion of world trade and its fabulous potential indicate the importance of maintaining a strong merchant marine. To fulfill that interest, we have a lot of ground to make up. President Johnson made this clear 2 weeks ago when he said our prosperity and safety through history have been linked closely to our role on the seas of the world, a role we can never neglect. The President added this:

"I believe," he said, "we are all increasingly conscious of the fact that as a great nation we have been laggard and we have been neglectful in many areas of our transportation responsibilities and our transportation opportunities."

"I am hopeful—greatly hopeful," the President went on, "that we can in the next few years shake off the effects of these neglected years and move forward to achieve the progress that we are so clearly capable of in every sector, from the highways on which we travel to the high seas upon which we sail."

As Secretary of Commerce, I take that to mean that you and I and everyone connected with the maritime industry are under orders to achieve the progress we are capable of in revitalizing the merchant fleet and enhancing its competitive capability through technology and modernization.

Regrettably, we must admit that the United States does not now rank where it should in merchant seapower. We have been neglectful. We have not acted to meet the challenges of change and our competition. When the world's most active trading nation employs its own ships for only 9 percent of its seaborne commerce, we are lagging behind our abilities as well as behind our competition.

The present state of the merchant marine requires this frank assessment of our maritime condition in view of an ever-increasing contribution in the form of subsidies.

Since World War II operating subsidies have added up to \$1.7 billion. And since the start of the fleet replacement program in 1955, construction subsidies have totaled \$600 million.

Clearly, subsidies, in themselves, do not provide the answers to our maritime problems. We have witnessed a decline in our maritime industry despite an increase in subsidies.

President Johnson is determined to strengthen America on the seas. In his state of the Union message he promised a new maritime policy. That policy is developing. About a year ago the President appointed an advisory committee representing management, labor, and the public to make recommendations to the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor on matters of maritime concern. The recommendations are taking shape.

In addition, we have created an interdepartmental task force on maritime policy under the chairmanship of Alan Boyd, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. The task force is working closely with the advisory committee, and on the basis of their respective findings Secretary of Labor Wirtz and I will soon be in a position to make recommendations to the President.

Secretary Wirtz has described the current weeks in which we have an unfortunate shipping strike as being crucial to the future of this industry. I agree. But I also want to assure you that, despite the enormous problems and despite the skeptics, we are moving toward the development of a more vigorous and versatile, a more efficient and competitive merchant marine.

Our goals must be to stabilize and then improve our merchant fleet.

Now any plan for improvement must be keyed to modernization. We possess the technological know-how to send to sea the mechanized ships so essential to compete with the vessels of other nations. By applying our technology, we hope to cut the costs of building, operating, loading, and unloading our ships. Mechanization aboard ship, of course, means a reduction in crews. But this should not obscure the need. For one thing, normal attrition already is reducing the seagoing work force. We'll have to recruit additional seamen. And for another thing, as we become more competitive with the ships flying the flags of other nations, and as our international trade grows, we will need more ships and thus more men—men building in the yards and sailing on the seas.

But isn't it the challenge of competition which has made this country the most productive and prosperous in the history of man? Isn't it the challenge of competition which has enabled our system to demonstrate its superiority, by allowing private enterprise to take risks and to exercise the initiative, imagination, and ingenuity to convert risks into success? Are we going to continue to be complacent about the fact that ships can be constructed and operated so much more economically by other nations, enabling them to take the shipping business away from us?

In the maritime industry, as in any other, private enterprise must bear the prime responsibilities for stability and progress.

As it is, these burdens are shared by management, labor, and Government. The immediate interests of each party are not always identical. Management and labor, quite naturally, are concerned with profit and wages. The Government's lasting obligation is to all Americans. But I want to emphasize this point: The ultimate responsibilities of each party, one no less than the other, are to the national interest.

In our system of free, competitive enterprise, I would prefer to see a diminishing Government role and an expanding private

August 3, 1965

18369

INFLUENCE PEDDLING?

Privately, oilmen point to what they consider influence peddling affecting the Phillips decision. They see it as significant that Puerto Rico was represented by the Washington law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, although Abe Fortas, a personal friend and confidant of President Johnson, denies he had anything to do with it. Oscar L. Chapman, an influential Democrat who was Harry S. Truman's Secretary of the Interior, was attorney for Phillips.

Udall's decision evoked dissension even within his own Department. Assistant Secretary of the Interior John M. Kelly, an independent producer and Udall's top oil adviser, didn't see eye to eye with his boss. Subsequently, Kelly quit his post and went home to New Mexico.

STATUS REPORT

Despite the opposition, including threats of law suits by some companies, it was soon apparent that Udall would stand his ground. "Other companies will be a little bit unhappy," he says, "but I'm willing to take the criticism."

Then Udall's opponents in the oil industry launched their counterattack. The companies that began lining up at his door with demands for foreign-oil-supplied complexes of their own were the same that had most vigorously objected to the Phillips decision.

Besides those interested in Puerto Rico, a sixth company proposed a petrochemical complex to be run on foreign oil in Appalachia. The company, Borg-Warner's chemical division, Marbon, reasoned that West Virginia has unemployment problems, too.

SERIOUS INTENT

While the companies are grimly serious about their Puerto Rican applications, they, as well as Udall, realize that he cannot approve them all without opening a wide breach in import controls. Thus, any company that has its proposal granted will be sharing relatively exclusive economic advantages. On the other hand, if a request is turned down, the threat of a court challenge would have a basis for being carried out.

Thus, the Secretary, still feeling his way on uncharted seas, is moving with deliberation. His staff points out that the Phillips plan took 2 years to be approved, so there is no need for hurry on the rest. Meanwhile, one company official says with ill-concealed glee: "I'm just waiting to see how Udall will wiggle out of this one."

VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in his Johns Hopkins address last April 7, President Johnson stated his willingness to enter into unconditional negotiations with North Vietnamese officials seeking to end the war in Vietnam. His hard-nosed militarist Ambassador to South Vietnam at that time, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, when asked about proposed unconditional negotiations, was quick to say that our President did not suggest unconditional negotiations, but only conversations. It would take a militarist to make the distinction between unconditional negotiations and unconditional conversations to try to end a war at a conference table.

Fortunately, in his recent press conference, President Johnson enlarged the invitation that was the high point of his Baltimore speech. He definitely stated our willingness to enter "unconditional discussions" over Vietnam. He added in his letter to United Nations Secretary General U Thant:

The United States is prepared to enter into negotiations for peaceful settlement without condition.

This is significant. It takes the ground from under militarists and warhawks, many of whom favor the bombing of nuclear installations in Red China, which is capable at this time of producing only the crudest sort of nuclear weapons. In other words, some of our generals and warhawk leaders of the minority party in the House of Representatives appear to advocate our waging preemptive war against Red China by destroying that nation's nuclear installations.

Furthermore, our President has stated explicitly that he is willing to discuss the four-point program of Hanoi which was announced last April. In other words, he has come closer to the demand of Ho Chi Minh, the president of North Vietnam, who has urged "free elections in Vietnam."

President Johnson, in his latest press conference, stated that we are willing to include representatives of the Vietcong in any negotiations and that this is not an insurmountable problem at all. He further indicated that we are willing to agree to free elections in the south, or throughout all Vietnam, under international supervision and that the purposes of the 1954 Geneva agreement on Vietnam "still guide our actions."

Notwithstanding this, he said that the machinery for this was "tragically weak" and that these agreements were "cruelly shattered" by the Communists.

The Hanoi program, announced last April, called for "observance by both sides of the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva accord" and urged "reconvening of an international conference along the pattern of the 1954 Geneva Conference."

If this is still the position of the leaders of North Vietnam, and if the Vietcong will select delegates to represent them at the conference table, it appears that an honorable peace or cease-fire in South Vietnam is well within the realm of possibility. Without a doubt, Ambassador at Large Averell Harriman has held some fruitful conferences in Moscow and elsewhere proposing a cease-fire in South Vietnam. Now our President, by his letter to Secretary General U Thant and his instructions to our Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg, has acted in a constructive manner toward extricating the United States from a commitment that was first made in 1954 under General Eisenhower. This action has proved by hindsight to be a mistake and this mistake has been compounded many times until now, instead of 2,000 men of our Armed Forces being involved in southeast Asia, 150,000 or thereabouts are involved, and many lives are being lost.

Here is an opportunity for the United Nations to demonstrate that it is more than a mere debating society and that by exercising some initiative it can become a real peacemaking force.

President Johnson has now made some modest enlargement of previous statements toward peace. His state-

ments are so clear and unequivocal that even militarists bent on preemptive war cannot distort their meaning.

In negotiating for a withdrawal of our forces we are presently able to negotiate from strength. If Hanoi is willing to have its delegates meet at a conference table and discuss ending this fighting and bloodshed on the basis of a stalemate, with election of a President of Vietnam agreed on at an early date to be supervised in the manner stated, then there is real hope for a cease fire, and peace may be just over the horizon.

Mr. President, those Republican leaders in the House of Representatives, including GERALD FORD, MELVIN LAIRD, and others, who urge that we unleash our air power against all industrial plants, installations, and cities in North Vietnam are in reality calling for all-out war in southeast Asia. This would bring North Vietnam and possibly Red China directly into the conflict, and could mean our involvement in a disastrous land war in southeast Asia. These warhawks are really opposed to unconditional negotiations to end the war in South Vietnam honorably.

To date, our bombing of North Vietnam has failed to weaken the Vietcong. In all likelihood, increased bombing will only stiffen enemy resistance. Our military situation there has been going from bad to worse. The only answer is a negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides which would offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to military victory.

President Johnson seems trapped politically by Vietnam. When he and others advocate negotiation so that we may withdraw our Armed Forces, the warhawks scream: "Appeasement. Send in more ground troops." If we send in more ground troops, they denounce this. These armchair militarists say we ought to win the war the easy way, by all-out bombing, not only of Hanoi but also of Red Chinese nuclear installations and airfields. Then, were thousands of American boys to be killed and this Nation bogged down in a terrible land war in southeast Asia, these presently warhawk Congressmen, including Ford and LAIRD, would next year be terming it "Lyndon's war."

THE AMERICAN SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have spoken several times during recent weeks about the sad decline of the American shipbuilding industry. The emergency in Vietnam, requiring the reactivation of 15 ships from the mothball fleet, has once again pointed up this continuing and worsening problem.

An excellent and timely article on the subject appeared in the Journal of Commerce dated July 22 of this year. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

18370

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

[From the Journal of Commerce,
July 22, 1965]

**SHIPPING OUTLOOK: U.S. SHIPPING TIEUP
LIMELIGHTS PLIGHT OF AILING SHIPBUILDING
INDUSTRY**

(By Charles F. Davis)

The U.S. shipping strike which has immobilized a major portion of the U.S. merchant marine could be serving a useful purpose, ugly and sordid as the situation may now appear. The tieup came about over such relatively narrow if thorny issues as shipboard automation. Already, however, it has directly or indirectly raised some much broader points. These include the purpose, scope and execution of the Nation's shipping laws and the objectives of the maritime subsidy programs. All this needs a thorough airing and, hopefully, it will get it in the months ahead.

The airing may well extend beyond the problems of the shipping industry as such, into the U.S. shipbuilding industry, for example, where the shipping tieup has brought into sharp focus an unhealthy state of affairs.

NEEDED IN A HURRY

The situation develops as a result of the Defense Department's decision to break out 15 vessels from the reserve fleet to move military cargoes to Vietnam in lieu of commercial shipping halted by the strike. The vessels are needed in a hurry and the deadline on reactivating the ships has been set for early next month.

Reactivating these ships, mostly World War II Victory-class vessels, is a considerable task to undertake in such a short time but not one which would normally be beyond the capacity of shipyards.

However, in at least one instance a New York yard has been forced to turn down some of this business because of the shortage of trained manpower.

PROBLEM NOT UNIQUE

Reports from Baltimore and other areas indicate that this problem is not unique to New York.

The fact of the matter is that the U.S. shipbuilding industry, lacking new orders and, as a matter of policy by the Defense Department, allocated only a marginal share of naval work, is withering on the vine.

It can't, moreover, wither much more before it will be unable to cope with the routine requirements of the U.S. shipbuilding industry, much less an emergency situation such as has been brought about by the strike.

A score of yards have gone out of business in the past decade and a number of big facilities owned by major shipbuilding firms have been closed because of a lack of business.

The shrinkage of the industry has brought with it a shrinkage of trained and skilled workers who, laid off or unwilling to continue in a precarious employment, have turned to other trades.

PART AND PARCEL

Thus, it is all too apparent that the plight of the U.S. shipbuilding industry is part and parcel of the whole problem of the maritime industry.

We submit, therefore, that this should be considered in any realistic appraisal of forthcoming construction programs, immediate or long range.

It certainly puts a new light on any proposal to build American-flag shipping in foreign yards, naval or commercial.

It might well be also considered in terms of the Navy's parsimonious assignment of repair work on naval vessels to private industry in favor of naval yards.

In sum, the work capacity of American shipbuilders is a vital part of the entire U.S. maritime picture and any realistic program aimed at restoring the maritime industry's

health should be drawn up with this in mind.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on the same subject, an editorial appeared in the July 30, 1965, issue of Life magazine. The editorial discusses the present strike in the maritime industry. I do not wish to assess blame or take sides in the strike. I do wish to emphasize the problem we have in the American merchant marine industry and that something must be done. American taxpayers have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in ships which are tied up at the same time that cargoes are being carried on foreign-flag ships because American ships cannot carry them, and also U.S. ships are flying foreign flags. The editorial states:

No new maritime policy will make sense until Washington solves this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine, July 30, 1965]

SINK OR SWIM FOR U.S. SHIPS

The U.S. Government pays out some \$350 million a year to subsidize a U.S.-flag, U.S.-built merchant marine. But when the Defense Department needed to expand its military shipments to Vietnam it had to hire British and Danish vessels for some shipments and then to mobilize some 30 U.S. ships. The reason for this costly humiliation of a traditionally great maritime nation was that most of our best cargo vessels have been tied up for nearly 6 weeks in one of the industry's perennial strikes.

This one, kept going by the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, has been termed "intolerable" and "against the public interest" by the Secretary of Commerce. Since U.S. taxpayers already get up 72 cents of every maritime wage dollar, and would normally pay 100 percent of any increase, he can say that "public interest" again.

MEBA represents 16,000 seagoing engineers who already average \$1,500 a month. It is known as the "head-kicking union" because at one session its president, Jesse Calhoun, was charged with jumping on the negotiating table and kicking a shipper in the jaw. Negotiations have since broken down, the tough issues being retirement income and automation. The owners have also lost confidence in the arbitrator but are willing to arbitrate almost anything under a new one, including any appointee of George Meany's. MEBA says no.

Joe Curran of the National Maritime Union, a third of whose sailors have been beached by it, calls this "a political strike" and "a threat to all other workers in the maritime industry." Curran is gored because the strike plays into the hands and treasury of the Seafarer's International Union, which means unsubsidized tramps and liners and whose chief, Paul Hall, has been Curran's bitter rival for many years. The fact that only part of the maritime industry is shut down also prevents the Government from invoking a Taft-Hartley emergency and sending the engineers back to work.

Chronic interunion feuding, extravagant demands, and ruthless tactics have cost the maritime industry 10 million man-hours since World War II. The subsidy formula, which offsets the fact that U.S. wage costs are three to four times foreign costs, has hitherto floated off the exorbitant settlements. But not this time. This strike co-

incides with a more general crisis in the U.S. merchant marine.

President Johnson promised last January to introduce a whole new maritime policy to replace the 1936 system. His lively young Maritime Administrator, Nicholas Johnson, has not only been scaring the unions and owners alike with boyish speeches but has threatened to keep new wage increases out of the subsidy formula and even disallow increases of several years past. U.S. shipowners, both struck and unstruck, are therefore fighting for their lives against rising costs, foreign competition, and uncertain Government policy. By tonnage, U.S. shipping's share of U.S. foreign trade has fallen from 50 percent to 9 percent since 1945. Large parts of the fleet have been scuttling to Liberian and Panamanian registry or counting their last days as elderling tramps carrying giveaway "food for peace" at subsidized rates. The U.S. maritime picture is gloomy indeed—except in one respect.

The authors of our 1936 subsidy policy, chiefly F.D.R. and Joseph P. Kennedy, knew what they were about. They wanted a first-class, liner-type cargo fleet sailing established routes—and that we have. It is second only to the British in size; in quality, second to none. The 15 leading U.S. lines (Grace, Lykes, Moore-McCormack, United States Lines, etc.) run their 300 vessels on a subsidy contract which requires them to keep their fleets modern; as a result, 80 percent of all cargo vessels in the world capable of more than 20 knots fly the U.S. flag. If U.S. foreign trade is measured by value instead of by tonnage, U.S. ships carry 37 percent of it.

Nicholas Johnson would like to see the Government out of the shipping business eventually. He sees no future in passenger subsidies and would cut cargo subsidies by relying on improved productivity through technological change, including such futuristic carriers as undersea pipelines and hydrofoils.

Undoubtedly great technological improvements lie ahead of ocean shipping, the most realistic being specialized bulk cargo ships. The industry itself has ordered 35 new "automated" freighters. But much of their automation is in the engine room, and MEBA refuses to agree to any fixed manning schedules in advance. This puts all savings from automation in doubt—the more so since any maritime labor settlement is subject to later interunion whipsawing.

Some owners have suggested a "czar" to save their industry from further strife and stalemate. Czars seldom solve anything, but this one might provide what U.S. shipping desperately needs, a period of labor peace while it adjusts to the throes of technological change. No new maritime policy will make sense until Washington solves this problem. The jobs at risk from automation will either expand with an expanding industry or sink with a dead one.

To the management
VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there have been comments on the floor this morning relative to Vietnam. Emphasis, and proper emphasis, has been placed on the military needs of the moment by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. Others have made their views known, as well.

I would reiterate that in the speech by the President last Wednesday he extended both the arrow and the olive branch. I endeavored to emphasize that point in some remarks I made last week, but due to the fact that they were not

August 3, 1965

18371

inserted in the RECORD in the form that I had requested. I ask unanimous consent that the nine avenues of honorable negotiations offered by the President of the United States in that speech and the press conference that followed be included at this point in the RECORD and that they be differentiated one from another, either through the use of asterisks or through the use of numbers.

I make this request because I think the President has just about covered every conceivable possibility in seeking to bring about a negotiated settlement of the situation now existing in South Vietnam and it ought to be clear that he has.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable. We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table.

I have stated publicly and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time.

Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions, with the help of 40 nations throughout the world. But there has been no answer. But we are going to continue to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the Government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposals. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield. And in this pursuit we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations.

And if the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

I've directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today and to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all the resources, and the energy and the immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

But we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

As I just said, I hope that every member of the United Nations that has any idea or any plan, any program, any suggestion, that they will not let them go unexplored.

And as I have said so many times, if any one questions our good faith and will ask us to meet them to try to reason this matter out, they will find us at the appointed place, the appointed time and the proper chair.

I have made very clear in my San Francisco speech my hope that the Secretary General under his wise leadership would explore every possibility that might lead to a solution of this matter. In my letter to the Secretary General this morning which Ambassador Goldberg will deliver later in the day, I reiterate my hopes and my desires and I urge upon him that he—if he agrees—that he undertake new efforts in this direction.

Ambassador Goldberg understands the challenge. We spent the weekend talking about the potentialities and the possibilities, our hopes and our dreams, and I believe that we will have an able advocate and a searching negotiator who, I would hope could some day find success.

We have stated time and time again that we would negotiate with any Government, any time, any place. The Vietcong would have no difficulty in being represented and having their views presented if Hanoi for a moment decides that she wants to cease aggression, and I would not think that would be an insurmountable problem at all. I think that could be worked out.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the President for the frankness he has shown in publicly making these proposals. I only hope that those who are interested in peace, who have eyes to see, who have ears to hear, and who can recognize print when they see it will take into consideration the nine choices, some of them cumulative, which have been offered by the President of the United States to the peoples of the world in seeking to bring about an honorable conclusion through negotiations to this most complicated conflict.

A FAIR AND REASONABLE PLAN FOR APPORTIONMENT WHOLLY CONSISTENT WITH DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last week, speaking of the reapportionment proposals now before the Senate, I stated:

If the majority of the people of any State decide that the majority shall each have less than one vote in the selection of the members of one of the bodies of their State legislature, it is my firm conviction that they should be permitted so to decide.

Writing in the Washington Star last night, August 2, 1965, in a column entitled "Dirksen's Apportionment Plan," James J. Kilpatrick thoughtfully and clearly set forth a point-by-point analysis of Senator DIRKSEN's reapportionment amendment, stressing that it "is founded surely and squarely upon the oldest principles of republican government."

I ask unanimous consent that the article by James J. Kilpatrick in the Washington Star for August 2, 1965, entitled "Dirksen's Apportionment Plan" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 2, 1965]

DIRKSEN'S APPORTIONMENT PLAN

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is one of those marvelous ironies of parliamentary life, that the merits of EVERETT M. DIRKSEN's amendment may yet be obscured by the radiance of his charm.

The venerable senior Senator from Illinois is struggling to win approval of a profoundly significant resolution, intended to preserve one of the great principles of American government; but the DIRKSEN enchantment is such that he might almost as well be speaking of his choice of the marigold to become the national flower.

Which is to say that not many of the Senator's friends or foes seem actually to have read what he proposes. They are enraptured, ensorcelled, overcome with delight.

In the past few months, DIRKSEN suddenly has emerged as an American institution, to be ranked in the Nation's affections somewhere between Jimmy Durante and Casey Stengel. * * *

As a consequence, people are not writing about DIRKSEN's resolution; they are writing about DIRKSEN's style. It is a terrible temptation. If the Senate has been long on ability in recent years, it has been woefully short on color. Now, after all these years, recognition has dawned that in DIRKSEN, some genuine color has returned. And we correspondents knock ourselves out to capture the charm of the guy; the face that looks as if he had slept in it; the rumped hair, like an old Brillo pad; the rolling eye, the eloquent hand, the sepulchral voice that sadly sighs at the insensitivity of his Democratic friends.

But he can't get the Senate's attention.

The assumption is that his reapportionment resolution would "thwart the Supreme Court," or "nullify democracy." About the most that ever is said is that the Dirksen resolution, if it were added by amendment to the Constitution, would permit the States to apportion seats in one house of their legislatures by factors other than population.

There is much more than this to the Dirksen proposal. It begins with that great and forgotten noun with which the Constitution itself begins—the noun that recurs four times in the Bill of Rights. "The people," it begins.

"The people of a State may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, or political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate." Here DIRKSEN is reaching to the very roots of sovereignty, to the people themselves. He would let them decide.

In the next phrase, he echoes the words. Before such a plan of apportionment could be adopted, it must have been submitted "to a vote of the people and approved by a majority of those voting on the issue." But this is not the only safeguard: When such a plan of apportionment is submitted to a vote of the people, "there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population."

What could be fairer? This was precisely what was done in Colorado, where the people twice rejected by overwhelming margins the bogus "democracy" one man, one vote.

The people are capable, DIRKSEN is saying, of deciding their own destinies better than the Supreme Court is capable of deciding for them.

Yet the Dirksen proposal has still one additional safeguard. The indefensible malapportionments of recent years cannot be

permitted to recur, even in one chamber, as a consequence of one decision, once made.

Every 10 years, any apportionment plan based on considerations other than population "shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people." There must be a continuing renewal of the people's consent to be governed by legislators of their own choosing, and not by "King Numbers."

This is what the Dirksen amendment provides. It is founded surely and squarely upon the oldest principles of republican government. We ought not to become so mesmerized by the Senator's parliamentary skill and by his beautiful basson voice that we fail to heed what the Senator says.

STOP TIGHT MONEY—END THE RESTRICTIVE MONEY POLICY OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last week, business loans of the leading New York banks fell for the fourth straight week. The decline since the 1st of July has now reached \$394 million. Here is proof positive of the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve System in action.

Three months ago, the Federal Reserve moved to place our banking system in a negative reserve position. The result for the last 3 months has been an average weekly reserve position of minus \$150 million to \$175 million. Sooner or later, as I and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], have consistently warned, this pressure on the banks would bring pressure to bear on business. Furthermore, the Johnson administration's basic fiscal policy—which looks to an expanding economy which can produce higher tax revenues at lower tax rates—is being placed in jeopardy.

I conferred with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and it is with his entire concurrence that we call for a reversal of the Federal Reserve's tight money policy.

During the past month, it has become the stated policy of the U.S. Government—declared so by Treasury Secretary Fowler—to work toward expansion of the international money supply by reforming the intentional monetary system. Soon it will be possible for this policy to be translated into progressive and enlightened action. But this policy will be meaningless, this action will be ineffective, if it is not based upon a soundly and continuously expanding American economy. It is now time for the fundamental and forward-looking revision of international monetary policy announced by Secretary Fowler to be accompanied by a similar revision of domestic monetary policy by the Federal Reserve.

The foundation that exists today for a continued expansion of economic activity is unprecedented—and should be unquestioned. But questions will continue to be asked, both at home and abroad, until all branches of the American Government agree in deed as well as in word that American prosperity is the No. 1 prerequisite for world prosperity. In order that this agreement may be made known to all the world, I once again call upon the Federal Reserve to end its tight money policy before a squeeze on money

becomes a squeeze on activity, profits, and jobs.

THE GROWING DANGER OF OUR CONTINUING UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, back in 1963, in a series of five Senate talks, I presented my growing apprehension about the continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

Since then there has been increased discussion of this subject along, with its relation to such program as first, offshore military expenditures; second, tourism; third, private investment and lending abroad; and fourth, foreign aid.

Some years ago the two nations representing the two power centers of East and West achieved what might be termed a "nuclear standoff"; a position that has been described in various ways: "Balance of terror," "two scorpions in a bottle," and so forth; and since then it has become increasingly clear that total victory, as known in the past, would be impossible in any future all-out war.

There is a sphere in which this Nation could suffer total defeat; and that is in the economic field.

For over 100 years various Communist leaders, especially Lenin, have pointed to that possibility; and I believe it could become more than a possibility if we do not face up to all the implications of this continuing unfavorable balance of payments.

This thinking has brought an increased interest in reassessment of our foreign economic policies; and it is based on that interest that I now present these thoughts.

With the sole exception of 1957, the United States has been running consistent balance-of-payments deficits for 15 years—since 1950.

Starting with 1958, these deficits became disturbingly large—and remained at a \$3 to \$4 billion level through the 1958-64 period.

As a result, the Nation's gold supply has dwindled some \$10 billion. Our gold stock now stands at less than \$14 billion with our current liabilities to foreigners, redeemable in gold, totaling over \$28 billion—more than twice the volume of our gold stock. That stock is now lower than it has been since August 1938.

Recently there has been a flurry of publicity that, as a result of voluntary actions, the balance-of-payments deficit is now licked. Any jubilation is premature. The President, in his press conference of July 9, was wise in caution, as evidenced by the following colloquy.

Question. Are the reports, sir, that the balance-of-payments deficit is wiped out in the last 3 months true, and, if so, what about some worry among economists that it will hurt the economy of Europe, that they will not have the dollars that they had before?

Answer. The reports I have read are highly inaccurate. They cannot be confirmed. We do not have the exact information.

I asked the Secretary of the Treasury to give me even his speculation. He refused to do that yesterday. After I read the wire service stories and stories in other periodicals,

I asked the Chairman of the Economic Advisers, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

All of them were unfamiliar with it. They said that the only thing they could say was that it was premature, it was inaccurate and undependable as far as the information to the President is concerned.

Now, in the days ahead, they may be exactly on the nose, but they are unwilling to say that in their position today, even to me, or to the task forces.

How long can this development continue before the dollar is forced into devaluation?

The answer is clear—not very long.

There are those who ask about the importance of a \$3 billion deficit in an economy where the gross national product approaches \$650 billion; and ask also of what real relevance is a foreign aid package of \$5.7 billion. In this connection, the 1966 fiscal year request for foreign aid was \$780 million for development loans; \$210 million for technical cooperation and development grants; \$580 million for Alliance for Progress; \$369 million for supporting assistance; \$271 million for contingency fund; \$206 million for the Inter-American Development Bank; \$500 million for the fund for special operations of the IDB; \$104 million for the IDA, the soft loan window of the World Bank; \$125 million for the Peace Corps; \$1,658 million for food for peace; and \$1,170 million for military assistance.

The answer is that our ability to continue our policies of lending and giving away financial resources is dependent upon first, the size of our gold stock; second, our net annual foreign earnings; and, third, liquid short-term assets abroad, less our short-term liabilities to foreign holders. It is not dependent on either our income, or our assets, in the United States.

Any continuation of a \$3 billion deficit in our international accounts can only mean that we will not be able to undertake much of the planned foreign aid and military expenditures programs. Actually, and as I have presented previously, we are already borrowing from foreign countries in order to carry out aid and military programs for these foreign countries.

If we continue in this fashion, there is real danger of a forced devaluation of the dollar; and this could well set off a chain reaction of diminished world trade and serious domestic recession if not actual depression.

With respect to foreign aid, never in history has any nation so willingly opened its purse to so many for so long.

In the early post-war period, we responded wholeheartedly to the needs of economic reconstruction, pumping billions of dollars into European and Japanese recovery. Of the \$64.5 billion in net foreign assistance provided between July 1, 1945, and December 31, 1957, \$53.8 billion, or 83.4 percent, was in the form of nonrepayable grants. Only \$9 billion was in long-term, low-interest credits, the rest being in sales of commodities under agricultural surplus disposal programs.

Of the total \$53.8 billion in foreign military and economic grants during this

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18375

U.S. POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the best editorial commentaries I have seen on the President's address of July 28, 1965, to the Nation on U.S. policies in Vietnam has been printed in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C. The editorial is entitled "LBJ Left Much To Be Desired" and was printed in the July 29, 1965, issue of the Greenville News.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks together with my newsletter dated August 2, 1965, and entitled "Prospects in Southeast Asia."

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, July 29, 1965]

LBJ LEFT MUCH TO BE DESIRED

President Johnson's address to the Nation and the world at his press conference yesterday on the administration's "new" plans for prosecuting the war in Vietnam left much to be desired on the part of American families directly affected and those who, as a matter of national policy and welfare, hoped for a definition of plans for victory.

It did not help at all in this respect for the President to turn from his rather general and even vague discussion of American battle plans and goals in Vietnam to his hopes for further extension of the benefits of the Great Society.

His folksy personal references and his declaration that he did not intend to see the hopes and dreams of the people swept away by war fell flat.

And against this backdrop his announcement of the appointment of John Chancellor of NBC to head up the Voice of America and of Abe Fortas to succeed Arthur Goldberg on the U.S. Supreme Court was sadly out of place.

On the one hand the President flatly stated, for the first time so far as we can recall, that the conflict in southeast Asia is a war between freedom and communism.

But on the other he said no declaration of war was needed because the Chief Executive had ample authority to do what had been done up to now and that he had been in constant consultation with the Congress and had received unstinting cooperation and support.

"This is war" Mr. Johnson said, and the United States positively will not surrender or retreat, for that way lies hopeless disaster and an invitation to further Red aggression in Asia and elsewhere.

But the President did not speak of victory as the goal of that war.

Instead, he digressed to declare that the United States not only intended to help the South Vietnamese to reach the point where they could set up their own government with free elections; it also will render economic assistance on a large scale.

Mr. Johnson announced that large numbers of additional troops will be sent to Vietnam, including specific units ranging from special battalions up to the new "Air Mobile" infantry division.

This outfit has been formed only this summer by taking crack units from the Nation's combat-ready divisions and training and equipping them to move entirely by air—going into battle in planes, helicopters and by parachute-drop.

But he said there were at present no plans for calling up reserve units or individual reservists, although recruiting efforts and the draft will be stepped up.

The President said he had asked Gen. William Westmoreland, the South Caro-

linian in command of all American forces in Vietnam what he needed to do the job assigned to him, although the General's mission has not been clearly defined to the public's satisfaction, and these forces and the necessary equipment were going to be supplied.

In his formal address the President defined the American goal in Vietnam as a limited one, although he didn't call it that. The purpose, he said, is to convince the Communists they cannot win, or rather that the United States cannot be defeated, by military force alone. The idea is to force the Reds to the conference table.

But he did not say American forces would be turned loose to do what is necessary to convince the enemy of this fact by inflicting on him a thorough defeat in and from the air and on the ground.

In his speech and in answer to questions, he emphasized that escalation of the war, especially a direct confrontation with the Soviets and the Chinese Communists, will be avoided if possible. More significantly, he said that the policy of having American troops serve primarily as advisers to the South Vietnamese, rather than taking over and running the war themselves, would not be changed.

He made no reference at all to the commitment of larger air and naval forces to stepped up air and coastal raids on the Vietcong training centers and supply bases in North Vietnam.

This is the crux of the matter. The United States is committing more troops to the confined battle area of South Vietnam. Their mission, presumably, is to make the war so costly to the Vietcong that they, instead of the South Vietnamese and the United States, will give up and ask for peace talks.

But the tactical and strategic problems of maneuvering such a force against the Communist guerrillas effectively on a battlefield and in tactical situations created by the Vietcong are staggering. It is hard to see more than a stalemate, at best, as possible in a war fought under such conditions.

Perhaps the President has issued orders he did not disclose for security reasons, but his emphasis on hopes for bringing "peace with honor" by negotiating with the Communists, hopefully with the full assistance of the United Nations, indicates the contrary. And he conceded that the war could continue indefinitely.

Mr. Johnson emphasized the importance of the war, and none can deny it. But the apparent limitations on goals and tactics are not in keeping with the gravity of the situation.

Mr. Johnson emphasized the importance of the war, and none can deny it. But the apparent limitations on goals and tactics are not in keeping with the gravity of the situation.

[From weekly newsletter by Senator STROM THURMOND, Republican, of South Carolina, Aug. 2, 1965]

PROSPECTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The President's announced steps to meet the crisis in Vietnam were significant. Even more significant, however, was his statement of U.S. objectives in southeast Asia, for these objectives provide the basis from which the prospects for the war can be measured.

Initially, the President rejected the alternative of surrender. He wisely pointed out that surrender would not bring peace, for "success only feeds the appetite of aggression."

Therefore, the President said, "We intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms or by superior power." There can be little doubt that the United States can, by committing large num-

bers of military personnel, avoid total military defeat in southeast Asia. Conceivably, we can occupy strong points in South Vietnam for decades, although the cost in casualties and resources may well be high.

Next, the President said, "We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table."

The prospects for negotiations appear unlikely. North Vietnam has rejected out of hand all overtures advanced by the United States and by other nations. Red China has shown an equal unwillingness to negotiate.

Some hope that the Soviet Union will assist in bringing about negotiations. Realistically, this too appears most unlikely. The Soviets have much to gain from U.S. involvement in a ground war in Asia. Against an essentially guerrilla-type offensive, the United States must confront the enemy with an overwhelming numerical superiority in an area 10,000 miles from the United States. In this area, the Communists have almost unlimited manpower in adjacent areas, and supplies from all the Communist nations.

Largely unknown to the public, the United States is already faced with a very serious and severe shortage of equipment essential to fight this type of war. Major resources will have to be committed as the war continues. The Soviets can also logically reason that the requirements for financing a ground war in Asia will cause the United States to increasingly divert resources away from its strategic military forces, which is the nemesis of Soviet expansion plans. In addition, the Soviets could and probably do reason that U.S. involvement in a ground war in Asia would make us less capable and less willing to respond vigorously to Soviet expansion efforts in other areas, such as Africa and Latin America.

It is unrealistic to believe that the Soviets would assist in bringing about negotiations which would end the conflict. Indeed, they are now supplying the Communist forces with equipment and supplies, including missiles, in order to assure that the Communist aggression can be sustained. The one major world power who has most to gain from a major U.S. ground war in Asia is not the United States nor Red China, but the Soviet Union.

In any negotiations the President stated that the United States would insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have "the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the south." The 1954 Geneva accord specified that elections would be held in Vietnam in 1956. The elections were never held, because it was obvious that the Communists, through the use of terror and intimidation, could win any election. In 1956, the Government controlled 70 percent of the territory; now, the South Vietnamese Government and the United States control less than 20 percent of the territory. The fact is, we could not even hope to win an election in South Vietnam. If we are negotiated out, even under the guise of free elections, we will lose Asia just as surely as if we pull out now; and the casualties we incur in the meantime will have been fought for naught.

To win the war in Vietnam, it would be necessary to bring to bear our real power advantage—air and sea power. It may also require that we use troops from the Philippines, Korea, and Nationalist China. Such actions would involve a risk of confrontation with all communism, including the Soviets.

In the final analysis, however, there is no realistic middle ground. We must either apply our power to win the war or get out, either now by surrendering, or later, after more casualties, through negotiations, if they ever come to pass. We cannot escape the immutable truth of General MacArthur's warning, "There is no substitute for victory."

18376

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

AN AUSTRALIAN VIEW ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Reverend Alan Walker, the director of the Central Methodist Mission in Sydney, Australia, writing in the August 4, 1965, issue of the Christian Century under the title "An Australian Looks at Vietnam," states:

The world outside the contending powers pleads: In the name of humanity, in the name of God, stop before it is too late. Turn from the battlefield to the conference table. Take risks for peace rather than continue the risks of war. Accept military disengagement now.

I echo his sentiments. I have expressed these views for a year and a half on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere.

I reiterate the pleas of many here in the United States for a cessation of the escalation of the undeclared war in Vietnam before it is too late.

The Reverend Walker's words should be heeded by all who would urge a further military buildup of armed might there. I ask unanimous consent that the Reverend Alan Walker's article in the Christian Century for August 4, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The same issue of the same periodical contained a thoughtful and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Runaway War or Deadlocked Peace" in which the options facing not only the major powers of the world but the world itself. The editorial concludes with the question:

Will American Christians and Jews and all other men of good will have the maturity and the energy to compel their government to choose those next steps which could lead from the brink of runaway war to the long hard pull that—the best we can hope for—is the deadlock of a peace in which neither side has victory and neither is destroyed?

Without such maturity and without such energy to persuade this administration to turn from the paths of war to the paths of peace, the dangers of a future thermonuclear devastation clearly lies ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Century, Aug. 4, 1965]

AN AUSTRALIAN LOOKS AT VIETNAM

(By Rev. Alan Walker)

In rare consensus, the Christian churches around the world are appealing for an end to the fighting in Vietnam. Through its international affairs section the World Council of Churches has said: "The effort to solve the problem of South Vietnam by military measures is bound to prove futile." The British Council of Churches "supports the worldwide plea for an end to the suffering of the people of Vietnam." Some weeks ago the United Church of Canada called on the Canadian Government not to support American policy in Vietnam if the war there should be further escalated—and now the escalation has occurred. Even in the United States the National Council of Churches has asked for "persistent efforts to negotiate for a cease fire."

On the other side of the world the Australian Council of Churches has declared that "now is the time to strive for a conference."

Japanese Christians have written to President Lyndon Johnson urging reappraisal of American policy. On July 20 a delegation of five Japanese Christians representing different denominations was to leave for the United States to tell church and Government leaders how the Vietnam conflict looks through Asian eyes, and to explore means of peacefully resolving that conflict. Heading the mission is Isamu Omura, moderator of the United Church of Christ in Japan and vice chairman of the East Asian Christian Council.

HOW STAY THE CONFLICT?

There are three ways by which the war in Vietnam can be halted. One is by a full-scale American military effort aimed at imposing peace through victory. But the price would probably be war with China, certainly a yearlong policing by the United States of a ruined and an embittered Vietnam, north and south. Another way is by negotiation. That way lies difficulties, as the cool reception met in Asia by the Commonwealth nations' peace mission indicates. Certainly if peace is to come through negotiation there must be a new spirit in Hanoi and terms more specific than "unconditional negotiations" from Washington. But the struggle for negotiated settlement must go on; peacemakers must not permit their patience to be exhausted by rebuffs.

The third way to halt the move toward disaster is for the United States to accept the Geneva Accords of 1954 and withdraw its armed forces from Vietnam. Surely America does not need to prove its opposition to communism by prosecuting an unnecessary war, a war condemned by great segments of the world's people and opposed by at least 40 percent of its own citizens. Surely withdrawal would be preferable to continuance of the agony of the Vietnamese people, to great power confrontation leading to nuclear catastrophe. The world outside the contending powers pleads: In the name of humanity, in the name of God, stop before it is too late. Turn from the battlefield to the conference table. Take risks for peace rather than continue the risks of war. Accept military disengagement now!

A WAR IMMORAL, UNJUSTIFIED

Disengagement as a prelude to peace in Vietnam is imperative. For one thing, the conflict there is immoral and unjustified. All war, says the Christian judgment, is incompatible with the mind of Christ. And this war is to a greater extent than most wars indefensible.

Vietnam has become a cockpit for the cold war. Behind North Vietnam and the Vietcong in the south stands the Communist world; behind the South Vietnam Government, the West. Competition for influence, desire to impress neighboring states, a test of will—these are the vital elements in the conflict. The United States and now my own country are committed in Vietnam to protect what they regard as their own interests; it is better, they hold, to engage the enemy as far as possible from one's own shores. But though apparently unquestioned, that assumption is immoral. The idea that others' lives and lands may be ravaged to protect one's own is a frank expression of power politics, a relic of imperialism. To the claim that Vietnam offers a time and place for confrontation between China and the United States, D. T. Niles, the Christian statesman from India, replied simply: "Here we ask only one question: Is human life cheap in Asia?" An Asian, he spoke with the voice of Asia.

The contention that escalation must occur so the United States can negotiate "from strength" is specious. To sacrifice countless lives for a bargaining advantage is expediency at its most callous. And one cannot help recalling that when his country was still master in the area the French general in

charge drew up a plan "to create military conditions for an honorable solution." Then came Dienbienphu and the end of French power in Indochina.

There is a fatal flaw in the argument that unless the United States stops communism in Vietnam all southeast Asia will "go Communist." For communism cannot be contained by military might; it is an ideology that breeds in the kind of chaos and misery war produces. Asian countries will be made "safe" from communism only through peaceful change and the expansion of social and economic justice. By the time the United States managed to "defeat" communism by military force, the peninsula would be a bloody shambles. Where then could a government be found that would be accepted by the people? The United States would have to buttress some sort of puppet government for years on end.

How can a war be justified that is embarked upon unilaterally by nations that at the same time are pledged to work through the United Nations? The United States has long contributed to the ineffectiveness of the world body by its irrational insistence on the exclusion of mainland China. Now it is further undermining its effectiveness by taking unilateral action without seeking combined world action through the United Nations.

All this has made millions of men of good will throughout the world uneasy in conscience; they know in their hearts that the war in Vietnam is basically immoral and without justification.

INTOLERABLE SUFFERING OF A PEOPLE

It is almost impossible to estimate Vietnamese loyalties accurately. That military governments can "represent" any people is questionable, and the present Government of South Vietnam is a military despotism, as were the eight regimes that preceded it through the past 20 months. Certainly the strength of the South Vietnam armed forces and their persistence despite huge casualties testify that a large body of opinion is opposed to the Vietcong. Yet it is hard to believe that the Vietcong could exert virtual control over about half the country without the collaboration of people from village and countryside. Neutral observers—the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs for one—report that there is among the Vietnamese a deep-seated desire to be independent. Certainly there is no doubt that the suffering of the people is deep and tragic. It has lasted for 19 long years. Terrorized by action both sides, subjected to atrocities, sniped at in the jungles, bombed from the air, decimated by the dread napalm bomb, one of the most hideous weapons yet devised, the Vietnamese see no end to their miseries. For the Communist and the Western nations to prolong their suffering is iniquitous.

As an Australian I was ashamed because of all the nations represented at the Commonwealth prime ministers' conference it was my country that by choosing to be a combatant in Vietnam embarrassed Prime Minister Harold Wilson's peace mission. Disengagement would make it possible for Australia to extract itself from a conflict into which it has been led, without debate, by a government that has been less than frank with our citizens.

Australia's present policies run counter to its own and its neighbors' long-range interests. For our future is irretrievably bound up not with the West but with the 1,000 million people of Asia, where the days of Western dominance are numbered. We must learn to live at peace with our neighbors. Meanwhile, the presence of our soldiers on Asian soil combined with our "white Australia" policy at home gives us an ugly image throughout Asia. From such an attitude as we now display are enemies made. And the Bible's

August 3, 1965

18377

warning still holds: They who sow the wind reap the whirlwind.

While freedom of speech remains, before casualties mount and emotions are dangerously aroused, there is still time for Australian troops to be withdrawn and an example of disengagement to be set as a prelude to peace.

AHEAD, NUCLEAR HOLOCAUST

Of one thing we can be certain: the world today faces its greatest peril since World War II. Consider the pattern of escalation thus far established. First, the United States simply proffered aid and advice to the government in the south. Then came military support, with mounting numbers of American troops engaged. Then retaliatory bombing of military targets. Then Australia's adding its quota to the flames by sending troops. Finally, on June 10, President Johnson's announcement that American troops would take the initiative in attack.

What are the later steps, unless arrested? Crossing of the 17th parallel; accompanied by bombing of the cities in the north, with the inevitable slaughter of noncombatant men, women, and children; then increased and open Chinese intervention. The West could have but one answer to the impossibility of countering the military manpower the 700 million Chinese can provide: nuclear bombing. Then—one short step to complete nuclear involvement and a third world war, leaving the planet contaminated with radiation for generations to come.

Impossible? Improbable? Hardly. Mental attitudes so easily lead to overt action. And there are forces, particularly powerful in the United States, that would urge the atomic bombing of China now as a means of keeping it from becoming a nuclear power. Corrupted by unreasoning fear of communism, public opinion in the United States, and to a lesser extent in Australia, could depart from rationality. The peril of all-out nuclear war lies just beyond the Vietnam firing lines.

Right now the world may be offered its last chance to pause and seek deliverance. The search for a solution in Vietnam must move from the battleground to the conference table. And for that, no matter what the risk or sacrifice involved, disengagements is a necessity. There is still time to reverse the tragic trend. I would hope that a ground swell of opposition to our Government's policies in southeast Asia might move across my own nation, that Australia might become a reconciling, a peacemaking force in today's splintered world. To seek peace, not to make war, is the call our people—as well as those in the United States—must hear. Let us demand that our troops be recalled, that the issues be transferred to the United Nations. Above all, as Christians let us pray that the miracle may take place, that the doors to peace missions now closed may be opened.

[From the Christian Century, Aug. 4, 1965]

RUNAWAY WAR OR DEADLOCKED PEACE

SAIGON, July 14.—In the judgment of this member of the clergymen's mission sent to southeast Asia at the end of June by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a dangerous turning point in the war in Vietnam is at hand. As Henry Cabot Lodge returns to the Embassy in Saigon and the White House starts a sweeping reappraisal of Vietnam policy, the only real alternatives in Vietnam itself, it seems to me, are a runaway war and a deadlocked peace. It is a shocking fact that the choice between these harsh alternatives is being made unilaterally, in this 20th anniversary year of the United Nations, by the U.S. Government on the one hand and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) on the other. The destiny of millions of people and perhaps of the whole world is being decided by a small group of military and political officers, with not much more chance of broad citizen-participation in the

decisionmaking process in the United States than in Vietnam, let alone among the many other peoples who will bear the consequences of the policies chosen.

I

All developments during this beautiful rain-then-sunshine-again summer in Vietnam indicate that on both sides those who possess the power of choice are moving swiftly toward runaway war. The Vietcong has astonished even its Chinese mentors in the art and science of revolutionary warfare by moving directly from the first phase—defense—to the third phase—offense—without bothering with Mao's prescribed second phase—a balance of forces. At Djakarta recently, a spokesman for Peiping stated that his government was studying the methods and strategy of the Vietcong, who in their 20-year struggle have become unequaled masters at effecting social transformations through revolutionary warfare.

The Vietcong are everywhere in South Vietnam. They have cut all major transportation arteries linking the several regions of the country, making air transport the only means of supplying either urban centers or mountain villages with food produced in the delta. They hold from one- to two-thirds of the area of many provinces by day as well as by night, leaving the Republic of Vietnam forces, with their American advisers, in the tense posture of beleaguered garrisons. By night the Vietcong hold this capital city itself in a ring of terror. Last Sunday evening about 10 p.m. my taxi driver missed the house where I am staying at the edge of the city—a bare 3 miles from downtown Saigon. As the road led through the dense tropical orchards toward the rubber plantations, he became quite anxious. Soon we were approaching the sources of some of the artillery fire that is heard in the city throughout the night, and we saw some of the flares with which the army posts continually flood the forest area with light. These are the measures by which the republican army tries to discourage the grouping of Vietcong forces for terroristic forays into the city itself.

But as everyone knows, the Vietcong is not merely an insurrectionary movement in the countryside, strongly supported by Hanoi, but a politico-military force within Saigon and the other cities of the south. There are terrorist strikes, such as those against the U.S. Embassy, the floating restaurant, the Saigon Airport, and very seldom do the passersby offer the authorities any evidence to help apprehend the offenders. I have talked with city people who, as both patriots and social progressives, are continually solicited by the Vietcong to join the national liberation movement to help overthrow the latest of Saigon's junta governments and to rid the country of the Americans, who are viewed as the remaining vestige of white imperial occupation. My interlocutors had reluctantly declined to enter the Vietcong only because they could not stomach its wanton violence. The Vietcong appear to sense that their people are closer to the goal of an independent Vietnam, free of the last traces of foreign domination, than they have ever been since the French first arrived a century ago. They smell victory and will stop at nothing in their effort to grasp it firmly in their hard and horny hands.

II

Meanwhile, North Vietnamese battalions are taking up positions back of the guerrilla warriors, ready to consolidate their gains. The Foreign Minister of neutralist Cambodia, Koun Weck, warned me in an interview that if these troops should prove unable to withstand the increasing number of U.S. paratroopers and infantrymen, "the Chinese will not hesitate to employ millions of soldiers in a combat with the United States on the ground in southeast Asia, and Peiping would

definitely use the nuclear arms at her disposal."

There is no need here to recall in detail the escalation of the American war effort in South Vietnam from a few hundred military advisers 10 years ago to more than 75,000 men today, supported by bombing missions originating both from aircraft carriers off the Vietnamese coast and from the Guam naval base more than 2,000 miles away. There is great need to hold congressional hearings and nationwide debate on the wisdom and rightness of current Pentagon plans to turn the large-scale American war effort into a massive land war in southeast Asia, whose immediate objective might well be an independent and friendly South Vietnam but whose ultimate goal would inevitably become—once the armed might of the United States became locked in mortal encounter with the North Vietnamese and the Chinese peoples' armies—the liberation of North Vietnam from the Communist rule of Ho Chi Minh and the overthrow of the imperialist Chinese Communist government of Mao Tse-tung.

Since every Western military expert believes that the United States possesses weaponry more than sufficient to balance the sheer numbers of the Asian Communist armies, the crucial question would then be the response of the Soviet Union. I have met no one in southeast Asia who believes that in such a showdown the Soviet Union could avoid giving modern military support to the poorly equipped armies of sister Communist nations. This feeling that such a situation would close the rift between the Soviet Union and China is based not on sentimental factors but rather on the sober surmise that a Pentagon which was allowed to destroy Chinese power would be expected by the Soviets to turn its sights at once on the Kremlin itself—the only logical outcome of the chain of reasoning that begins with the attitude of "Why not victory?" The Soviet Union too has to worry about falling dominoes. The likelihood is that, as this fear begins to dominate the planners who control the levers of command at the heart of both the vast affronting blocs, the brush-fire on the Mekong delta will blaze into a runaway conflagration.

The Cambodian foreign minister terminated our conversation by saying: "The world is at an extremely dangerous turning point in the Vietnamese war. The peace efforts of the American clergymen's committee are laudable but, I fear, doomed like all others to failure. The world is headed straight toward nuclear war."

III

The peace movement on the American campuses and in the American churches has long been aware of the sinister character of the war in Vietnam. It has reminded all who would listen that the struggle there is basically political and must eventually be resolved by a political settlement, that military power alone cannot obtain any end that could be termed victory. And it has pointed out the very real and perilous possibility that one-sided concentration on military force will end in general war.

Most of those Americans who have urged President Johnson to stop the war in Vietnam have responded to his question "How?" by calling for negotiations. When pressed for more detail they have envisaged the reconvening of the Geneva conference or something similar and have insisted on a return to the 1954 agreement for a reunified Vietnam in which a national government would be established on the basis of free elections. These elections, the withdrawal of foreign armed forces and the integrity of the total territory of Vietnam would be guaranteed by some kind of international peacekeeping police power.

I am sorry to have to report that in the course of innumerable conversations held by

the 12 members of our clergymen's mission in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand, we heard no knowledgeable person call for reunification of the two Vietnams. Not only does no one we met believe it to be a possible political objective at present, but most would seriously question its desirability now or for years to come.

We were astonished at the depth of the antagonism between the North Vietnamese and the South Vietnamese, whatever their individual political coloring—particularly between the Tonkinese, who predominate in the north, and the Cochinese, who constitute 80 percent of the population of the south. When the Chinese exercised their 1,000-year suzerainty over the area that now comprises the two Vietnams, they were always obliged to handle them separately, and the French did likewise during their century of colonial rule. One reason for the governmental instability that has characterized South Vietnam for the past 10 years is that many of the top posts have gone to able and aggressive men among the refugees that came from the north in 1954. No Cochinese has yet been Prime Minister or President of South Vietnam. In university circles and among religious groups—e.g., between the two main Buddhist reform movements—this same regional tension obtains, rendering unified action all the more difficult.

IV

In a word, a deadlocked peace—one in which continuing division of the country is the only reasonable and perhaps the only realizable basis for political settlement—is the true option to a runaway war. But a separate South Vietnam can be achieved only if the National Liberation Front participates in its government. And here lies a formidable obstacle to all negotiations. There have been indications that the "unconditional" discussions suggested by President Johnson might countenance Vietcong representation in the delegation of North Vietnam. But the people with whom I talked unanimously declared that this arrangement would never be accepted by the National Liberation Front, arguing that the N.L.F. and its Vietcong warriors, while quick to utilize Ho Chi Minh's skilled personnel and his material support, have no intention of turning over to him and the detested northerners the fruits of 20 years of struggle and suffering. The N.L.F. will insist on being represented at the conference table in its own right, and a good share of the cabinet posts in any coalition government must go to it.

What kind of society would this coalition government offer the continuing Republic of South Vietnam? It would have as its base, my respondents answered, a planned economy in which landlords would have a diminishing part—a "national socialism" such as Algeria and other new nations are trying to establish. But as for foreign policy the country would be nonaligned, on the model of neighboring Cambodia—swinging toward China if pushed too hard by the West but swinging toward the United States and France if pushed too hard by China. Like much of the "third world," most South Vietnamese who think in geopolitical terms aspire to national independence, economic development under a socialist type of government and elemental security from hunger and violence.

V

Could such a small neutralist state remain independent against new pressures from North Vietnam and eventually from China? It is clear that the viability of such a South Vietnam could be guaranteed only by the continuing presence of an international peacekeeping force. But from all sides I have heard it affirmed that no whites, be they American or Swedish, Russian or French, would be acceptable for this task. Only an international police force composed

primarily of representatives of the armies of India, Burma, Indonesia, and the smaller countries of the area—and quite possibly Africa as well—would have a chance of being accepted as essentially different from colonial powers.

This vision of the future will not please many Americans, and it may seem to be an entirely inadequate reward to many of our military leaders for all the risks run, materials consumed, lives lost. But will our Congress reassume its constitutional authority to control the warmaking machine? Will our President restore to the State Department the role of supreme adviser in the making of foreign policy? Will American Christians and Jews and all other men of good will have the maturity and the energy to compel their Government to choose those next steps which could lead from the brink of runaway war to the long, hard pull that—the best we can hope for—is the deadlock of a peace in which neither side has victory and neither is destroyed?

HOWARD SCHOMER.

BIG BROTHER: FEDERAL SNOOPING

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, my Big Brother item for today consists of two unusually good editorials. One is from the Miami Herald, of July 21, 1965, and the other is from the Times of Corpus Christi, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, July 21, 1965]

CASE OF FEDERAL SNOOPERY

Some of us who fuss about big government and bureaucracy often are set down as lowly beaters of dead horses. But look what big government and bureaucracy begot in the Internal Revenue Service.

A Senate subcommittee which has been looking into charges of invasion of privacy by revenue agents has uncovered some examples of unrestrained folly.

Wiretapping is practiced so widely that there are government schools where agents are trained in its niceties. A recruit can also learn how to pick a lock, plant a microphone, set up a two-way mirror and operate gadgets that see in the dark.

All of this is not only illegal; it's even forbidden by departmental regulations. Thus these invasions of privacy make a hypocrite of the law itself, which is perhaps their worst offense.

Of course, it is all done in a good cause. Many a hoodlum would have gone tax-free as well as scot-free but for some kind of surveillance on which the law frowns. The temptation is to write off this activity as a necessary evil in the complicated process of doing good.

We think, however, that the law ought to be observed or repealed.

In practice, it is not considered illegal to tap a wire or bug a room unless conversations which are picked up are in turn disclosed officially. Yet evidence of this sort cannot be used in court.

So the law becomes not merely hypocritical but inconsistent and thus ridiculous.

Privacy, like water, is ignobly polluted in the United States today. The Senate hearing may have the effect of cleaning up some of the sources if a shocked public opinion becomes the detergent.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Times, July 3, 1965]

PRIVACY

Quite a little attention has been focused lately on invasion of privacy by units of the

Federal Government. The public has been made aware that thousands of Government employees are given "lie detector" tests or psychological tests featuring intimate personal questions, that the post office pries into who gets mail from whom, that there is a lot of authorized and unauthorized listening in on phone talk in Government offices, and so on.

Congressional committee probes have brought most of these disclosures. That is the first half of a pattern that has emerged. The second half, more often than not, is a promise by the offending agency that it will be less snoopy—less in violation of the basic American right to privacy—than in the past.

The State Department, for example, has been reviewing use of psychological tests, and may modify its practices. Postmaster General Gronouski, after admitting that the so-called mail covers "do to some degree invade individual rights," has issued new administrative rules intended to keep this extralegal practice under better control.

This is an unsatisfactory way to deal with a problem that touches closely on a constitutional right we should be zealous to preserve—the right to live our private lives without Government prying. The pattern of disclosure followed by promises to do better in the future is not adequate. What is needed is congressional action to reaffirm the principle of individual privacy, and to keep the actions of Government agencies firmly in check.

THE HUNGER EXPLOSION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week I spoke to the Senate on the danger of the world's hunger explosion, and the urgent need for the United States to do more in order to save millions from starvation and crippling malnutrition. I was gratified to read, in the Sunday newspapers, two articles which illuminate the dimensions of this crisis and discuss what can be done to cope with it.

In the Washington Post, Jean M. White gives a graphic picture of the developing situation in her article, "The Poor Are Engulfing the Earth."

In the New York Times, an article by Felix Belair, Jr., gives a detailed discussion of an important new program just launched by our Agency for International Development to combat malnutrition in preschool children in developing nations. His article is entitled "U.S. Acts To Raise World Nutrition."

I ask unanimous consent these two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1965]

THE POOR ARE ENGULFING THE EARTH; THE POPULATION EXPLOSION—ACTUALLY, A HOLIDAY FOR DEATH—IS OCCURRING WHERE IT'S LEAST SUPPORTABLE

(By Jean M. White)

In just 35 years—when many of us still will be around—it is very likely that there will be twice as many people on earth as there are today.

The time to do anything about that, if we had wanted to, was yesterday. The population problem is here and now and grows bigger by at least 1¼ million people each week.

Population projections used to be interesting mathematical exercises enabling demographers to predict when a standing-room-only sign would be posted on a crammed earth. But today we are finding that runaway population is bound up with

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18413

ington, there is constant need for refreshment of the soul in beauty and harmony.

Such notes were struck on July 26 and 28 with the beginning of a series of outdoor concerts at Washington's National Cathedral. The "Summer Festival of Chamber Music," as it is called, began with a program of trios by Mozart, Haydn, and Schumann. It will extend, in the coming weeks, to vocal, choral, and other instrumental presentations.

The scene of the concerts is the Steps of the Pilgrims, which lead upward to the south transept of the Cathedral, where floodlights silhouette the gothic spires against the darkening blue sky. The listeners are surrounded by the ornamental shrubbery of the Cathedral gardens, where birds accompany the performers from time to time.

In the words of music critic Irving Lowens of the Evening Star newspaper, these concerts have been a sensational success from many points of view. One indication was the overflow, first-night audience estimated at between 1,500 to 2,000. Mr. Lowens further observes that although many cities have long enjoyed classical music during the summer, this new venture in Washington should provide encouragement and an excellent precedent.

Although the names of those responsible for the festival do not appear on the program, I understand that it was conceived and planned by Mr. Richard Dirksen, who also plays a leading part as the keyboard artist, in its execution.

Werner Lywen, the concertmaster of the National Symphony Orchestra, and John Martin, its first-chair cellist, head the list of the other outstanding performers.

Mr. Dirksen, who has been with the cathedral for the past 20 years as its associate choirmaster and organist, now occupies the position of director of advance program. This office was established a year and a half ago for the purpose of expanding the institution's ministry by presenting events such as the festival as free offerings from the cathedral to the community.

In my judgment, the cathedral and these individuals have enriched life in Washington by providing pleasant entertainment in an inspiring setting.

I would thus like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to reflect the appreciation of one member of the Senate District Committee and undoubtedly many grateful citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the schedule of future concerts, together with reviews from the Washington Post and Evening Star, be printed following my remarks:

There being no objection, the schedule and reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL ANNOUNCES A SUMMER FESTIVAL OF CHAMBER MUSIC

Monday, July 26 and Wednesday, July 28: Trios of Mozart, Haydn, Schumann, and Mendelssohn; Werner Lywen, John Martin, Richard Dirksen.

Monday, August 2 and August 9: A chamber chorus, music of Gesualdo, Vecchi, Hinde-

mith, Thomson and Van Delden; David Koehring, conducting.

Wednesday, August 4: A Lieder program, Diana Beveridge, soprano; Thomas Beveridge, baritone; Norman Scribner, piano.

Wednesday, August 11: Music for flute and oboe; Carl Tucker, flute; Ernest Harrison, oboe; Richard Dirksen, harpsichord.

Sunday, August 15 (in the cathedral): The festival chorus; masses of R. Vaughan Williams and Poulenc, David Koehring, conducting.

All concerts are free beginning at 8 p.m. in the amphitheater, south of the pilgrim steps, and will last about an hour and 15 minutes each.

Each program preceded by a carillon recital beginning at 7:30 p.m., Ronald Barnes, carillonneur.

Few chairs or benches are available in this area. A grassy slope is the main provision for our guests, who are urged to provide their own campstools, blankets or other "sitzen" materials. In case of damp ground, recitals will be in the cathedral.

Parking is extremely limited on the cathedral close. Come early and by Massachusetts Avenue, Wisconsin Avenue, or Woodley Road bus if at all possible.

The cathedral will remain open until 10 p.m. on each of these evenings, but no aids will be on duty. Your quiet postconcert visit is most cordially invited.

CATHEDRAL CONCERT OFFERING PRAISED AS "FESTIVAL" EVENT

(By Charles Crowder)

At last Washington has the makings for a unique and glorious summer festival of music. On the basis of last night's first concert of a series this week and next month, Richard Dirksen's organization of outdoor musical events on the grounds of Washington Cathedral should easily grow into something that would attract visitors from far and wide.

It was by far the most engaging and delightful summer music that has come my way in Washington for a decade. Dirksen, Werner Lywen, concertmaster of the National Symphony, and John Martin, first-chair cellist of the same joined forces as they have many times in the past, and brought us trios of Mozart, Haydn and Schumann.

Aside from the relaxed and gracious music-making from the players, the cathedral grounds proved to be spectacular as a setting.

A small platform, backed and angle-roofed, was open on three sides and placed near the bottom of the wide steps leading to the newly completed south entrance to the cathedral. About 300 chairs were at the foot of the stairs, not nearly enough to hold the crowd which brought blankets, chairs, baby carriages, books and children to hear the music.

Boxwood, magnolias, dogwood and holly banked the staircase. As darkness closed in, the lights in the boxwood, those in the archway of the door above and on the tower created a scene around the musicians at once both peaceful and exciting . . . the sort of atmosphere best described as majestic.

But for the newness of the edifice it might well have been the Baths or Basilica of Constantine in Rome, a Cathedral Square concert in Spoleto, or a concert in the Mirabel Gardens in Salzburg. And it must be said that had the concert been given with any less than such perfect planning and care for details, things would not have been so rare and so thoroughly enjoyable.

The crowd sat on the lawns for at least another 50 yards out from the chairs. No amplification system was used but with the spell cast by the scene and the music, only the occasional zoom of a locust (which managed a close rhythmic pulse in the second movement of the Haydn) and a goodnight chirping of a cardinal interrupted the calm of listening conditions.

It was a very special evening. The three musicians, longtime friends and playing partners, were in fine form. They will take the same spot over again Wednesday night, this time with other trios of Mozart, Haydn, and the Mendelssohn D minor. A half hour of carillon music will be played by Ronald Barnes before concert time at 8 p.m. See you there.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 27, 1965]

NEWS OF MUSIC: CONCERT AT CATHEDRAL A SUCCESS IN THREE WAYS

(By Irving Lowens)

NOTE.—Werner Lywen, violin; John Martin, cello; Richard Dirksen, piano. Outdoor amphitheater, Washington Cathedral. Program: Piano Trio No. 5 in B flat, K 502, Mozart; Piano Trio No. 16 in D, Haydn; Piano Trio No. 2 in F, Op. 80, Schumann.

The first of seven free summer chamber music concerts presented by the Washington Cathedral in its outdoor amphitheater took place last night, and from many points of view, it was a sensational success.

For one thing, there was the size of the audience. It was a bit difficult to estimate, since the amphitheater has no chairs or benches, and people were pretty widely scattered. However, my guess would be somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000, which is roughly three to four times the capacity of the Coolidge Auditorium. Not bad for piano trios.

And those on hand did not come just because it was a nice evening, although the weather may have helped to increase the crowd. They came to listen to Mozart, Haydn and Schumann. They acted as if they were at a concert as indeed, they were and they gave the excellent performers full attention.

For another thing, there was the loveliness of the setting. The three musicians played from a tiny, wood-frame shell perched on the steps approaching the southern facade of the Cathedral. As dusk fell and the shadows deepened, the thrust of the Gothic spires against the deep blue sky was awe-inspiring. It would be difficult to think of a European festival that takes place in a spot more visually attractive.

It would seem that the potential of a summer series of outdoor cathedral concerts is limitless, but it would not be fair to those who conceived this inspired idea to leave the impression that perfection has been achieved at one full swoop.

The one big difficulty at the moment—and it should not be underestimated—is that bugaboo of all outdoor music: bad acoustics.

The musicians play from a spot well above their listeners, and the slope of the grass from the base of the steps is downward. If you think about the architecture of all theaters (indoor and outdoor), you will recollect that the audience invariably looks down upon the performers—that is, the slope of the seats from the edge of the stage is upward.

The reason for this was plain yesterday—sound, like smoke, rises. As a consequence, what one heard down below was a pale echo of the three instruments, lacking both highs and lows and with middle tones faint and dull.

Thus, John Martin's cello (even were he not handicapped, in the Haydn D major trio, with a line which doubles the piano more often than not) was barely audible; Werner Lywen's violin sounded more like a cigarbox fiddle than a fine instrument; and Richard Dirksen's piano reminded me of the "practice uprights" I used to avoid on campus in my student days.

This was most unfortunate, because from the evidence, the Messrs. Lywen, Martin, and Dirksen were playing extremely well.

I was following proceedings score in hand, so I feel confident in saying so. They simply were not getting through in aural tones.

The program, although featuring familiar composers, consisted of rather unfamiliar works. Only some 4 years separated the B flat Mozart (one of the finest of his eight piano trios) from the D major Haydn, but there is a world of difference in the manner in which the two men handle the combination. Mozart looks forward to Beethoven; Haydn looks back to the trio-sonata.

The Schumann F major trio, the least performed of his three is characteristically romantic and impetuous, while it does tend to be a little verbose, it contains some remarkably eloquent pages.

Tomorrow, the Lywen-Martin-Dirksen combination returns with a completely fresh program: Mozart in E; Haydn in A; Mendelssohn in D minor. At 7:30 p.m., half an hour before the concert begins, the Cathedral's carillonneur, Ronald Barnes, plays a short recital.

If the Cathedral's advance program committee can get the acoustics straightened out, Washington will get a present of a superb outdoor series of fine concerts.

Bring your folding chairs, camp stools, and blankets; sit in close; applaud loudly. The least the city's music lovers can do is to testify to the fact that Washington wants more than the service bands, the pickup orchestras, and the Carter Barron lollipops during the long, long summer.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Thursday, July 29, 1965]

CATHEDRAL TRIO DRAWS THROG

(By John Haskins)

NOTE.—Werner Lywen, violin; John Martin, cello; Richard Dirksen, piano. At Washington Cathedral Amphitheater. Program: Trio in E, K. 542, Mozart; Trio in A, Haydn; Trio in D Minor, Op. 29, Mendelssohn.

There may have been as many as six or seven hundred persons attending the second in Washington Cathedral's series of outdoor chamber music concerts last night, but it was hard to tell. They sat in seats provided on the cinder roadway below the south entrance, they clustered on the dripping steps, they gathered on soaked slopes, and they just stood around.

One would have expected the concert to be moved indoors, but Richard Dirksen listened to the strong though inaudible vox populi, and seeing them gathering outside, changed his mind for the third time and decided to go ahead with the original schedule of place. It made trying conditions for everyone, not least of all the players, but it was cool, though dank, and the only audience loss during the concert was accounted for by cranky children who had to be removed when darkness fell.

Sound, though not focused, was adequate for anyone who could take up a position within a couple hundred feet. In the peculiar acoustical situation, the Mendelssohn trio came off best, because of its restlessness, its sweeping romantic character, and because the cello was kept in its high range most of the time. A close second was the Haydn, its natural strength asserting itself through scoring not so heavy as the Mendelssohn. There was better ensemble in the Haydn, also.

Least successful was the Mozart, its patrician grace designed for surroundings more intimate, its open writing designed to be undertaken only after rather more rehearsal than this performance suggested it might have had.

Two things can be said for chamber music in what the Cathedral chooses to call an amphitheater. There is no more magnificent backdrop in the area for music of any kind, with the thrusting Gloria in Excelsis Tower dignifying all that falls within its

shadow. And if hundreds of persons will gather for chamber music under conditions far less than adequate, the need is unarguable.

Substitute a proper shell for that junky-looking plywood hut, even located where it is, and Washington will have something special in the way of summer chamber music—better than Meridian Hill Park 25 years ago.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to the subject of the war in Vietnam. In the course of my remarks, I shall express some respectful disagreements with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in regard to a speech that he delivered on the floor of the Senate on July 28, which I did not have the privilege of hearing because I was engaged in committee work. I have supplied the Senator from Wisconsin with an advance copy of my remarks this afternoon.

On July 28, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] spoke in the Senate on the subject of why the United States has not followed the procedures of the United Nations Charter in connection with Vietnam. In general explanation of administration action, the Senator said:

We cannot turn to the U.N. for practical reasons. Use of the U.N. Assembly and use of the U.N. Security Council are both blocked.

Yet a few sentences later, the same Senator said:

The President also said that if the United Nations can by deed or word bring us nearer to an honorable peace, it will have American support, and that Ambassador Goldberg has been directed to tell the United Nations that we want all resources of the United Nations used to achieve peace.

I assume the Senator from Wisconsin was quoting with approval those statements of the President. He is in the position that so many administration supporters are in of saying that we cannot turn to the U.N. but if the President turns to it, fine. Over the weeks and months since early 1964, there has been an amazing chronicle of American policy spokesmen explaining why one avenue for action in Vietnam was closed to us, only to be followed by a turn down of that very avenue within a short time.

This has been true of statements on escalation of the war, and it has been true of statements on use of the United Nations. If we know anything for certain about the conduct of American policy in Vietnam, we know that just because an alternative is rejected today does not mean it will not be used tomorrow.

And I know that the vast majority of those defenders of the administration will support the administration if it should place the whole matter before the U.N., just as they now support the administration in not placing the matter before the U.N. This is the real meaning of the opinion polls which are so often cited to prove public support of the policy in Vietnam. They prove that the public is still putting its trust in the President, not that they believe any one given policy is the best or the soundest. I do not doubt for a minute that if Am-

bassador Goldberg were to ask for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to consider the threat to the peace in Vietnam—an action we are duty bound to take under the terms of the charter—the American people would continue to say they have confidence in the handling of the Vietnam situation by the President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What the Senator is saying, as I understand, is that if in the judgment of the President the time appears to be propitious, if the time appears to be right, if the situation has changed or has become modified, if under those circumstances the President proposes to take a different course with regard to the United Nations, he might receive the support of many Senators, including the Senator from Wisconsin.

In reply to the Senator from Oregon, the position of the Senator from Wisconsin is that the situation does change. There are many reasons that might bring about a change, many of which are within the knowledge of the State Department and the President of the United States, and are not available, at least to the Senator from Wisconsin. It seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that, if the President of the United States wishes to follow a different course in the future than he has in the past, that does not mean that he was wrong in the past.

It does mean that the President of the United States has information that might be persuasive. I am not saying that I give him a blank check because I do not. But I do say that the President of the United States, under new or different circumstances, might be able to make a case which would convince the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators that his course was correct.

The situation changes. It is very subtle. Often the changes are behind the scenes. For perfectly obvious reasons, they might not be available to the general public. They cannot be. I say under those circumstances it makes sense for the President to change his policy as time goes on. The worst kind of policy is one which would freeze his feet in concrete and never permit change.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to say good-naturedly and out of love and affection that by the same argument it does not show that the Senator from Wisconsin was right in the past.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, I agree.

Mr. MORSE. I have been expressing the point of view for the last 2 years that the Senator has been dead wrong for the past 2 years.

Mr. President, I do not doubt for a minute, either, that the politicians and the newspapers who are now defending our refusal to live up to the charter would be the first to defend our resort to it if that became the policy of the administration.

What we have from the Senator from Wisconsin and from the Washington Post, which he quotes, is a defense of the President. Do either of them mean to say they would express public opposi-

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18415

tion to laying Vietnam before the Security Council if the President decided to do it?

Of course not. They would be the first to explain the advantages of such a move.

The great, basic flaw in the line presented by the Washington Post and the Senator from Wisconsin is that they set up a strawman which they proceed to knock down. It is nothing but a strawman to say that supporters of the United Nations indicate that going to the U.N. would put an end to the whole struggle. I do not know of anyone who has held out the promise that the United Nations could or would eliminate the problem of Vietnam.

The problem would continue to exist, but it would be considered in a new context and a new forum and not solely in the context and forum of a confrontation between the United States alone on one side and Communist powers in Asia on the other side.

Second, it is a great, and glaring assumption of their presentation that the United Nations Charter is no more to us than it is to Communist powers—a device to be used when convenient and ignored when it is not convenient. The directives of the charter on what to do when a threat to the peace occurs are not contingent on whether they are practical for any particular nation. There are many times when any constitution is not practical. But if we are to have a rule of law either in one nation or among nations, the procedures designed in the calm of an international deliberation to cope with threats to the peace must be followed.

Fifty years ago, Americans were shocked when Kaiser Wilhelm referred to a treaty obligation of the German Empire as "a scrap of paper." The treaty was not convenient and not practical for the needs of the German Empire at that hour, so that was the end of the treaty.

Today, we have an American policy that views the United Nations Charter not as a solemn national obligation but as impractical and inconvenient. Where is our national honor as pledged by our ratification of the United Nations Charter? Where is our word as a nation that we will submit to the Security Council any dispute to which we are a party and cannot resolve by peaceful means?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I feel certain that the Senator from Oregon knows that the Senator from Wisconsin has never been a rubberstamp for the President of the United States, who, when he was the majority leader, had great power in the Senate. The Senator from Wisconsin was the first on the floor of the Senate to attack procedures under which the Senator from Texas was operating. The Senator from Oregon strongly supported the Senator from Wisconsin in that position. But I took the initiative and criticized the major leader on many issues. I shall do so in the future now that the former Senator from Texas is the President.

I do not criticize him in this area because I agree with him. However, I

invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the fact that any nation, under article 35 of the United Nations Charter, can bring any dispute or situation to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly; yet they have not done so. Why? Does this mean that all the nations of the United Nations are wrong, and that only the senior Senator from Oregon, in this particular case, is right?

Mr. MORSE. Ninety of them receive our foreign aid.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, yes, they receive our foreign aid; but a number of them do not get it. Some of them that receive our foreign aid have been very quick to criticize the United States for all kinds of factions adverse to the United States. And certainly those 90 nations are not so corrupt that they would sell their moral obligation for foreign aid.

No, the time is not ripe. The other nations in the world know that to bring this matter before the Security Council now would not make sense.

First. They know that there is a likely veto in the Security Council.

Second. They know that the United Nations Assembly is paralyzed and has been able to move only on procedural matters, and barely that, as a matter of fact, in the past 4 or 5 months. There is no prospect that the United Nations Assembly will be able to take action in the near future.

It is hopeful that Ambassador Goldberg and President Johnson may be able to change the situation. The situation may change in the future. I hope and pray that it will. But the fact that they have not acted to date has the affirmation and support of the other nations in the world. Yes, a hundred other nations could bring up the matter. Why have they not done so?

Mr. MORSE. May I say two or three things before I proceed with my speech? Many of the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin are answered in the speech.

Many of the nations that are not now receiving foreign aid have never given up hope.

I do not charge the Senator from Wisconsin with being a rubberstamp. He will not put words either in my mouth or in my speech. I merely say that I believe the Senator from Wisconsin has followed bad judgment and reasoning in following the President in his unconstitutional and, therefore, illegal war in Asia.

The senior Senator from Oregon does not intend to follow the President in fighting a war, which the President now admits is a war—he started his admission last Wednesday—that has not been declared.

As I said in my reply to the President last Wednesday, he is conducting an illegal war. He is without the slightest authority to conduct that war, under the Constitution. The Members of the Senate and House who voted to seek to delegate power to the President to declare war cannot resolve their action under the Constitution, for they have no right to delegate the power to make war. All that Congress can do is to declare war.

The senior Senator from Oregon intends to continue to take the position he has taken, calling either for a declaration of war or for our stopping the making of war and the taking of American boys to their slaughter in South Vietnam.

Many persons are disturbed because I said last Wednesday—and I repeat it today—that when life is taken illegally, those who take it become guilty of homicide. In my judgment, we cannot justify the homicides for which the President, or Rusk, or McNamara, or Bundy, or Lodge, and the rest of them are responsible in conducting an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam.

So far as the other nations are concerned, they have the same legal obligation under the United Nations Charter as has the United States. Their failure to have the Security Council convened does not make our failures to do so right. Furthermore, the United States is a major belligerent; we are a party to the dispute. Therefore, more provisions of the charter apply to us than to others, and we have an even greater moral responsibility to live up to our obligations under the United Nations Charter. That is why, for 2 years, I have been pleading from this desk, and I shall continue to do so, short of a declaration of war, to do what I can to get my country to start living up to its obligations under the United Nations and to stop being an outlaw Nation, which we are so long as we violate our obligations under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does it not make sense that the President of the United States, before he takes this issue to the Security Council, should do everything within his power to create a situation in which he can obtain affirmative action from the Security Council to try to dissuade Russia, and perhaps France, from acting adversely toward us? Does not the Senator from Oregon conceive that this may take a great deal of time, and that weeks, perhaps months or even years may be needed to cause a change in the situation? There has perhaps been a change in the attitude of the Soviet Union recently. This is the kind of a situation into which the President would be wrong in blundering at any time, regardless of the situation. He must work carefully with the State Department, with his ambassadors, with those who are talking with the Russians, people who are competent and have good judgment concerning the situation. Should he not permit the new Ambassador to the United Nations to have an opportunity to observe the situation and use his enormous ability in this regard?

It seems to me that to urge the President to act impetuously, without regard to what the other members of the United Nations may do, may be technically correct, according to the words of the charter; but it seems to me that it could be a most unwise policy, and not the way an effective, successful policy is achieved.

The Senator from Oregon recalls, I feel certain, how effective the former Senator from Texas was as majority leader. He was very careful, before he moved, to make certain that he had his "ducks in a row." He worked for a consensus. He made sure that all his bases were touched. All this takes time; it cannot be done immediately. Not only does it take time, but—and I feel sure the Senator from Oregon will disagree—it takes a display of power and takes a demonstration of our resolution to act militarily. These are the ingredients that must be woven into the fabric.

Does the Senator from Oregon really believe that the President should be required to act impulsively, suddenly, or automatically?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked me a question; I shall be glad to answer it. The question is: Do I, in essence think it makes sense for the President to follow the course of action he has been following in South Vietnam?

My answer is: No. I have seen no sense in the President's course of conduct in Vietnam. To the contrary, I have seen the President write one of the most sorry, sordid pages or chapters in American history by his course of conduct in Vietnam.

"Time," pleads the Senator from Wisconsin. During that period of time, boy after boy has been taken to his slaughter in the escalated war in South Vietnam. If it is time the President has needed in order to take this matter to the United Nations Security Council, he should have stopped killing boys in South Vietnam. By escalating the war, he has been clearly in violation of all his powers as President of the United States.

The course of conduct that the President has followed in South Vietnam is completely unjustified with regard to his violations, in my judgment, of one international law obligation after another. It would not have taken any time to live up to the treaty. If we have pledged ourselves to obligations under the treaty, then we have no right to continue for months and months to violate that treaty on the basis of the rationalization that time is needed to get "ducks in a row"; that time is needed to get the matter before the United Nations Security Council. No time was needed other than to lay the matter before the Security Council and tell it that we were willing to support the Council's taking jurisdiction.

I know what is going on, in part, in regard to this position. The President is aware of a rising opposition to him at the grassroots of America for his failure to take the problem to the United Nations.

Now he is talking, in his press conference of last Wednesday, about sending Ambassador Goldberg to the United Nations with a letter to U Thant. That is merely a lot of semantics. He should have sent the Ambassador to the United Nations with a resolution in behalf of the United States, and instructed the Ambassador to lay the matter before the Security Council. That is what the President needs to do.

There will be plenty of time after we get that resolution formally before the Security Council, for all the negotiations alluded to by the Senator from Wisconsin. There will be plenty of time to consider, as I shall say later in my prepared manuscript later this afternoon, for the negotiations and discussions to take place.

Some other nations may then come forward with different proposals, and out of the various offerings, I believe they will hammer out a final resolution that I pray to God will result in the United Nations taking jurisdiction in South Vietnam and ordering a cease-fire and bringing about the steps that I sincerely hope will bring this affair to an end.

I yield now to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, does not the Senator also overlook the fact that, as the President said in his speech on July 28, that on 15 occasions, working through 40 nations, we have sought to negotiate with the North Vietnamese, with the Communists? We have tried again and again. We have agreed to negotiate any time, anywhere, with anyone.

We are still persisting in that endeavor. As the President said, we are asking that all of the resources of the United Nations be used in this endeavor. The President may have decided that it would be ineffective and impractical at the present time to go to the Security Council. That decision is concurred in unanimously by every member of the United Nations. Any nation could go to the Security Council. However, none of them do.

It would seem to me that it is wrong to say that the President has not taken such action as he could in an effort to try to bring an end to this tragic situation and try to negotiate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply to the Senator from Wisconsin is that every so-called semantic offering of the President of the United States is accompanied by other language which rebuts his offer. All that the President has ever had to do with to send up a formal resolution and lay the matter before the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the procedures of the United Nations Charter.

Starting with the President's speech at Johns Hopkins, every public professing that he has made and all the peaceful overtures concerning Vietnam have been made while, at the same time, he has been killing, as a result of his orders, boy after boy, and thousands of civilian people in South Vietnam. He has attached to every one of his semantic offers, terms, conditions, and qualifications that made any hope of a United Nations jurisdiction fly out the window.

The only way in which we can lay this matter, under the law, before the United Nations would be to submit a resolution. That is what I have been pleading for for 2 years. I do not intend to have any of the verbalism of the President of the United States fool me as to the fact that we have not formally and officially and in keeping with our obligations presented this matter to the United Nations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oregon completely overlooks the fact that, while the President of the United States has again and again sought negotiations, he has most recently said that we will discuss the situation in Vietnam even on the conditions which have been implied or suggested by Hanoi—on their own conditions. Not a single time have the North Vietnamese or the Chinese Communists agreed to negotiate on any conditions, anywhere with us or anyone else. Their answer has been "No, No, No".

It would seem to me, under these circumstances, that the President of the United States is not killing boys out there, and the Senator from Oregon knows it. We should recognize the fact that we are there at the request of the South Vietnamese Government, to help defend against Communist aggression. The North Vietnamese are doing the killing. They are engaged in aggression. We are trying our best to defend the people of South Vietnam, and to negotiate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, they are killing under the invitation of a group of puppet corruptionists, crooked political tyrants financed by the United States. That is the sordid chapter of the history that we are writing.

I cannot imagine a greater non sequitur policy than the position of our Government that we are there at the invitation of the South Vietnamese Government. That is a group that we have set up. That is what history will record.

I love the Senator from Wisconsin. However, he and I could not be further apart than we are in respect to this great public issue. We are as far apart as opposites can be.

Mr. President, I shall go back and repeat a couple of paragraphs of my text, because I believe they should be emphasized.

Today we have an American policy that views the United Nations Charter not as a solemn national obligation, but as impractical and inconvenient. Where is our national honor as pledged by our ratification of the U.N. Charter? Where is our word as a Nation that we will submit to the Security Council any dispute to which we are a party and cannot resolve by peaceful means?

It is the policy of ignoring those obligations that is destroying the good word and the international honor of the United States.

We are not obliged to find out first what the U.N. may do in Vietnam. We are not obliged to find out whether the interests of the United States will be advanced in Vietnam by the United Nations. We are simply obliged to lay the issue before the U.N. That we have not done, and it is not being done by the various letters between U Thant and the American administration.

The only letter to U Thant that will fulfill our treaty obligation is a letter asking him to lay the Vietnam issue before the Security Council. It can be done that way. The Korean aggression was done that way. Once it was made the business of the Security Council, the United States had something to say

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18417

about what action the Security Council should take in Vietnam.

There are many possible courses for the U.N. to follow. It could ask for a reconvening of the Geneva Conference of 1954. I have been asking for it for 2 years. It could ask for the jurisdiction to be taken by the SEATO nations. I have asked for that course to be followed for 2 years. It could ask the belligerents, including the Vietcong, to meet in conference. It could prescribe some preconditions or not. There is a great variety of courses open to the U.N. But most of them are not open to the United States acting alone. We are the sole belligerent, for all practical purposes, on our side. The Government of South Vietnam is our creature, and it rises or falls according to the support it receives from the U.S. Treasury. The men who run it live off American economic and military aid, without which they would all disappear from view. As President Johnson well knows, it is often not possible for one element in a conflict to impose its will on its opponent. Settlement more often comes by the work of a third party who is able to arrange and negotiate and suggest alternatives and exert a third party opinion upon both sides.

That is what the United Nations is supposed to do. That is why disputes that the parties cannot settle themselves are supposed to be put before the Security Council. Do we set up the United States above the interests of world peace? Do we believe that we have some security interest in Vietnam so vital to our national existence that the machinery mankind devised at the end of World War II to save future generations from the scourge of war deserves to be scuttled?

Speaking on television Sunday, the Nation heard the most respected figure in American military affairs, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], point out that we have no vital American security interest at stake in Vietnam. That is a contention that many of us have been making here in the Senate for a long time. It is not a popular theme down at the Pentagon, but the Senator from Georgia knows it to be true, nonetheless, and I am satisfied that the great bulk of the American people, also, know it to be true.

What we are scorning the United Nations Charter for is not a vital strategic interest of the United States. We are scorning it because we think we have to save face. We are scorning it because we believe that once we have put our American stamp upon a government in Saigon, we must send as much money and as many American boys as may be necessary to keep it going. We have already shifted our policy from one of helping the Vietnamese to save themselves to one of doing the job for them. What President Kennedy called a war the South Vietnamese must win for themselves is now overtly transformed into a war the United States must win for itself. And President Johnson's warning of last summer that we must not send American boys to do what Asians must do for themselves is repudiated by

his own announcements of 125,000 troops to be sent to Vietnam.

We think we are saving face in Vietnam, but surely we are not saving freedom. Again, as the Senator from Georgia stated to the Nation, the people of South, as well as North, Vietnam would probably elect a government headed by Ho Chi-minh if given a chance. He pointed to another obvious but unpopular truth, which is that no leadership has developed in South Vietnam despite our 10 years of massive financial and military support and that the United States is better off out of such a country than to continue to fight with its own people for its existence.

I note the Secretary of State felt obliged to deny the conclusion of the Senator from Georgia about sentiment among the people of South Vietnam. No doubt he feels all that money we have spent there must have produced at least some favorable result.

Let me say for the RECORD that I would rather have the opinion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on the situation in South Vietnam than that of 10 Rusks, 10 McNamara's, 10 Bundy's, 10 Lodge's, 10 of each of those responsible for the blueprint who have gotten us into this shocking, embarrassing situation in southeast Asia.

Why not hold the election and find out?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Come on, Senator, does the Senator agree—really feel—that North Vietnam, a police state, will permit an unrigged vote or even could? North Vietnam is completely dominated and controlled by the Communist Party. The people of North Vietnam have available to them only such information as the government wants them to have. They see the world strictly through Communist eyes.

There are more people in North Vietnam than in South Vietnam. We know that there are Communists in South Vietnam who might vote for Ho Chi-minh. And under present circumstances North Vietnam would vote as they do in Russia and China—unanimously. Would not the kind of election the Senator from Oregon is proposing result in a sure, predictable, grossly rigged takeover in South Vietnam by the Communist Party? Would this not result in virtually unprecedented genocide and destruction of the people of South Vietnam?

Mr. MORSE. I shall reply briefly now, and at greater length later. There are so many false premises in that list of pretty interesting premises laid down in the question of the Senator from Wisconsin that I must reply briefly to a few of them. The Senator from Oregon says North Vietnam is a different kind of Communist country from Red China or Red Russia. The Senator from Wisconsin is talking about communism, as so many people do, in blanket terms. The type of appeals to the inhabitants of North Vietnam, the type of municipal governments they are allowed to operate in many of the towns and cities of North Vietnam, would lead me to characterize

that part of the regime more as approximating a Socialist government than Chinese or Russian communism. Ho Chi-minh, who was, not long ago, a hero, is a paradox of contradictions and political ideologies. He has a surprising amount of procedures within his government that the Senator and I would call democratic procedures. But the fact remains that North Vietnam is a Communist country, and I despise it, as I despise all forms of communism. But I am not going to be a party along with the Senator from Wisconsin in agreeing to a blanket characterization of North Vietnam as a Communist state, leaving the implication that it is the same as other Communist states.

Next, the Senator from Oregon has not been talking about North Vietnam under a trusteeship and protectorate. I have been speaking for the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their government. The Geneva accords did not set up a government in South Vietnam. The United States did that, in clear and open violation of the Geneva accords of 1954.

The record is also clear that there has been little more political freedom in South Vietnam than in the North. Candidates for office are as carefully screened there as in the Communist zone.

I have always pleaded, and will plead again, to set the record straight, for a supervised election in both zones under which the people would have the right of self-determination, under the doctrine, which we profess but of which we have become notably in violation. I would give to the people of South Vietnam the right of self-determination. But—and this is what the Senator from Georgia was talking about—if we went to an election in South Vietnam, either Ho Chi-minh or his candidates would win in South Vietnam. That is what has resulted from the deterioration of American policy in South Vietnam.

That is why I say I completely discount any appraisal of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, Bundy, Lodge, and Taylor, have been dead wrong on each of their representations on Vietnam that I do not find them to be reliable witnesses at all with respect to South Vietnam.

If the Senator will bear with me a while longer, he will find in my speech that I shall again propose a United Nations protectorate of South Vietnam. That does not mean that we would have North Vietnam rule South Vietnam. That does not mean we would have what the Senator from Wisconsin is alluding to, a so-called blood bath in South Vietnam. As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the Senator from Oregon would always insist on a procedure that does not let the Vietcong kill South Vietnamese in a blood bath or that does not let the South Vietnamese kill the Vietcong in a blood bath. But when it comes to methods and cruelties and terrorism in South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese are no different from the Vietcong.

Both sides have been in violation of the Geneva treaty in connection with handling of war prisoners. The other day, as I announced on the floor last Wednesday, at long last the International Red Cross has found it necessary to take cognizance of man's inhumanity to man there by both the Vietcong and the South Vietnamese.

There must be a protectorate there. I have also called it a trusteeship. I do not care what label is used. But it must be a third party trusteeship, just as Franklin Roosevelt, 20 years ago at Teheran and Cairo, proposed for all Indochina.

But now we have the trouble spot in South Vietnam. At the very least now, we should move in, through a concert of nations, to change the situation in South Vietnam from one of warring to one of enforcing the peace.

I do not know what the United Nations may decide, but I am willing to talk with the Senator from Wisconsin about some hypothetical questions. I would not be in the least surprised if the United Nations decided to take jurisdiction either under the Security Council or through the General Assembly, and then to set up a protectorate, and that their first demand would be for a ceasefire.

I would pray for that. I would also pray for bringing the killing to an end on all sides, and to send in whatever number of divisions of many nations would be necessary—as I say later in my speech—to enforce that ceasefire.

If anyone believes that a ceasefire will end the shooting 100 percent, he could not be more wrong. It did not do so in the Congo. It has not done so in the Gaza Strip. It has not done so in Cyprus. It has not done so in the Kashmir. But, it is much better than a full-fledged war, and offers a much better hope for mankind to lead itself into the path of peace rather than to complete destruction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, we all wish for a ceasefire, and we all wish to stop the killing. The question I asked the Senator from Oregon, however, was in response to his question, "Why not hold elections and find out?" He is talking about Vietnamwide elections, is he not?

Mr. MORSE. Elections in both South Vietnam and North Vietnam. There is no question about what North Vietnam would do. Let me say respectfully to the Senator from Wisconsin that I believe we are 10 years away from an election. We must have a protectorate for 10 years before we can have an election on unification. That is the United States doing, back in 1956.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about what the Senator is proposing, a Vietnamwide national election. In that kind of election—

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is wrong.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Ho Chi-minh, of course, would have a big advantage.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is wrong. I am proposing an election in North Vietnam, and I am proposing one in South

Vietnam; but I am also saying that Ho Chi-minh would win in South Vietnam probably with 80 to 90 percent of the votes. Once we get out of Saigon, support for the puppet administration which the United States is financing vanishes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator says and I read word for word from the text of his prepared speech:

Ho Chi-minh's followers or General Ky's followers would win a nationwide election throughout all of Vietnam.

Perhaps the Senator does not mean what he says, but his statement certainly is clear to me. It means a nationwide election between the followers of the present government in South Vietnam and followers of the government in North Vietnam. If it does not mean that, it does not mean anything.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wisconsin refuses to take into account that back of it is the United Nations' protectorate. The United States must find out what the feeling is in South Vietnam, and what the feeling is in North Vietnam in regard to support for certain parties, if any; and, of course, they should find out what the support and feeling is in regard to unification at the present time. But, that is not going to create unification at the present time. If we have a protectorate, the protectorate is not going to vanish. In my judgment, we must have a United Nations protectorate in Vietnam for probably up to 10 years in this particular trouble spot of the world.

Mr. President, if the Geneva Agreement of 1954 is now good enough for us, why not permit the canceled election to proceed? There is nothing to be proved by arguing in the United States whether Ho Chi Minh's followers or General Ky's followers would win a nationwide election throughout all of Vietnam. Only the people in Vietnam can settle that question. The Geneva Accord states that such an election was to have been held in 1956 under the supervision of the International Control Commission. Discussions were to have taken place between officials of the North and South to settle the details of time and place of voting.

It was at that point that the United States and South Vietnam junked the Geneva Agreement because we were afraid of what the outcome of the election might be.

But now President Johnson is talking again of the possibility of nationwide elections there. Let us go ahead with them. At least we would uphold the element of our national honor which professes great confidence and belief in self-determination.

An election of this kind, too, is something that might be better advanced through the United Nations than by the United States speaking alone.

Finally, I note that the Washington Post editorial, and the Senator from Wisconsin in referring to it, regard the potential veto of the Soviet Union as the total obstacle to U.N. action. Of course, the possibility of a veto has no bearing whatever upon the procedures that are mandatory under the terms of the char-

ter. To talk about a possible veto as a reason for not going to the Security Council is not to talk about a reason, but an excuse. Guesses as to what the Soviet Union might do are nought but excuses for not fulfilling our legal duties.

But how do we know what the Soviet Union will veto? We have not put any course of action for Vietnam before the Council. Probably there are many potential U.N. actions that the Soviet Union would veto. Probably there are some that France and China would veto, too. But until we make a suggestion for U.N. action, we have not the slightest idea what Russia might veto. And it is also entirely possible that the Soviet Union might make a proposal that would prove workable.

The Soviet Union did not veto the Cyprus peace mission. We tried to keep Cyprus out of the United Nations, too, because we wanted to handle it through NATO, and we used the excuse that if it went to the Security Council, Russia would veto it. But the Cyprus issue was put before the Security Council, anyway, and the peace mission was sent without a Soviet veto.

I have no way of knowing whether the Soviet position would be the same or different on Vietnam; but neither do those who wave the flag of a Soviet veto as an excuse for not going to the United Nations.

I would also point out that they are already giving not only the Soviet Union, but North Vietnam a veto over U.N. action. We read again today that Hanoi has ruled out any United Nations intervention until the American troops have left. Why should Hanoi be given great power status at the United Nations? Why do we give her an equal weight in the Security Council with the other five great powers? Yet we do it every time we point to Hanoi's objections to U.N. action as a reason for not taking action through the United Nations. It is not for North Vietnam to say what action the United Nations may or may not take in cases of a threat to international peace, any more than it was North Korea's. North Korea was not a member of the United Nations. We did not give North Korea a veto power. We laid it before the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations took jurisdiction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oregon knows very well what happened in the Korean situation, that the Soviet Union was boycotting the Security Council. It was not present and, therefore, could not physically exercise its veto. This was a fortuitous happening from our standpoint. That is not the situation today. I doubt whether the Soviet Union will be caught napping again, certainly not in the South Vietnamese situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Soviet Union was not caught napping in North Korea, in

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18419

my judgment. She found it a convenient way for sending the problem to the Security Council, but she stayed for Cyprus. In thinking about the Cyprus situation, the United States had to get kicked back into the United Nations on Cyprus. France and Russia were the leaders in support of Security Council action in Cyprus.

That is a good precedent to wrap around Russia's neck in any debate in the Security Council, over the matter of jurisdiction in connection with the crisis in South Vietnam.

Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that we do not know until we try. This is the argument which the Secretary of State has been advancing for almost 2 years, before the Committee on Foreign Relations; and I keep saying to him:

Mr. Secretary, why do you not find out? Why do you stop reading the charter? Go ahead and read the rest of the charter; and if Russia does veto it, you have proved to the world by that veto who it is that does not wish to follow the rules of law for settling the threat to the peace of the world. Take them to the General Assembly, and I will tell you how many I believe you would get there—a minimum of 90.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is exactly what the Senator from Oregon and I disagree on.

Mr. MORSE. Try it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that we cannot determine foreign policy on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that—

Mr. MORSE. We certainly could not do a worse job than the one which is now being done in the State Department.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that without very careful preparation with Russia, without knowing precisely what Russia is likely to do, it would be an exercise in futility, or worse—it could mean premature repudiation. That could forestall constructive agreements later.

There may come a propitious time, and it is very important that that time be prepared for with the greatest care. Russia might very well absent herself under the right kind of circumstances, but it is very important that they be fully prepared in advance. This must be done in a way so that it will work. It is not wise that we move in merely because we can do so under the charter, technically. That does not make any sense to me. That is exercising the most futile kind of diplomacy.

Mr. MORSE. It may not make any sense to the Senator from Wisconsin, but it was right in 1954. That is how long it has been right. The argument is made that we must have more time to put our ducks in a line. That is what the Senator argues. It is argued that we must have more time to get ready to see what Russia will do.

I do not believe in that kind of secret diplomacy. The American people are entitled to have the President and the Secretary of State out in the open, with open covenants openly arrived at. In regard to the war in South Vietnam, they are entitled to have the President and the Secretary of State take them into their confidence. They are entitled

to have their President and their Secretary of State follow the clear procedures of the United Nations Charter, and to file a resolution, or to use one of the alternatives.

At the request of the President I have worked hard on the international law aspects, to give him a memorandum which would provide for an alternative resolution.

I do not quote the President, but his advisers have found no fault with the legal analysis of the Senator from Oregon. We get from them the argument that the Senator from Wisconsin has made, that they doubt that it is practical. Of course, my good-natured reply is, "Why not find out?" If it is not practical, let us find out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oregon, who is an extremely experienced man in these matters, and who has been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee for many years, knows perfectly well that we cannot discuss all these matters publicly. He knows that it might be extremely embarrassing to Russia because of her relationship with China and North Vietnam. That would be true under certain circumstances. He knows that these things must be discussed privately; otherwise there would be very little chance of success.

The Senator from Wisconsin takes the position that that time may never arrive. On the other hand, the time may come.

Mr. MORSE. I fear that that is the Senator's position.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The time may never come. If it does not come, the President would have been mistaken to go to the Security Council. He might suffer an action that might be extremely adverse to our interest and the interest of freedom and, in the long run, adverse to the interest of peace. There may be other ways of achieving this than by relying on the Security Council or of the General Assembly, that could be prejudiced by such an action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator has outlined the difference of opinion that he has with me.

It is not possible to have a rule of law on the basis of responding as an outlaw to one's responsibility as a signatory to a treaty. That is where the Senator from Wisconsin and I part company.

I believe that we have an obligation to take these matters to the United Nations. I disassociate myself from what I consider to be the implication of the Senator from Wisconsin, that he thinks it is perfectly all right for our Government to engage in so-called secret diplomacy. That can mean the difference between life and death for millions of Americans. We cannot even gain access to it, as the elected representatives of the people in Congress. They tell us what they want to tell us, and no more. I am a great advocate of Woodrow Wilson's policies, one of which was open covenants, openly arrived at; and also of Woodrow Wilson's concept as to the constitutional duties of a President of the United States. He enunciated that principle in Congress in the historic joint session of Congress on the night of April 2, 1917, when he pointed out to Congress that it was his

constitutional duty to come to a joint session of Congress and make a recommendation for a declaration of war, and that he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

I thought, as an old teacher, that it might be helpful for the record to get that lesson from Woodrow Wilson into the Record, which I did last Wednesday, for the edification of my President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is taking the position that the United States is wrong, and he has previously said that our hands are dripping with blood. He says that although the President of the United States has said again and again that he wants to negotiate, has indicated that he is willing to go along with the 17 so-called neutral nations, and has turned to the United Nations, for example, by asking the Secretary General to use his office for intervening, and so forth.

Despite all that, the Senator from Oregon now says that he is going to give the United States no choice, but that we must act at once, that we must move into the Security Council, without any preparatory action at all; that we must act at once, and that we alone among all nations must conduct our negotiations in public, in the headlines, in front of the world. I submit that the Senator from Oregon is really handcuffing our Government, and suggesting rules of procedure that the Communists do not care about.

There are moral forces, of course, of which we must be aware, and we must do all we can to play by the rules. However, this world is not a Sunday school. We must do our best and recognize that we must act with all the moral means that we can find, and always with moral ends. However, at the same time, it is proper, it seems to me, to operate discreetly and try to persuade nations to come around to our view quietly and privately in a way which would do the most good.

Also, we must time our action in accordance with our best judgment as to what action can best secure peace. This Nation wants peace. The Senator from Oregon has never said that this Nation wants to get any territorial benefit out of the war in Vietnam, or that we want to get any economic benefit out of Vietnam.

In that sense the Senator from Oregon would agree that our hands are clean, and that all we want is peace.

What we disagree on is the tactics. I say that we should give our country an opportunity to work with weapons which will enable us to win the peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator not only on tactics, but also on the fundamental and basic policy of our country in Vietnam.

Let me make these comments on the verbalistic and semantic offerings of the President of the United States. I disagree. In each one he has a sleeper clause and terms and conditions that make impossible his professions of his desire for peace, and make impossible getting the results that he would like to have the people think he is seeking.

The Senator has heard me say many times that I do not pay much attention to what politicians say, unless what they say can be squared with their actions.

So the President has caused me to come to the conclusion that until he is willing to keep our Nation's trust under the United Nations Charter by filing a resolution calling for United Nations action, it does not make much difference what he says.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] again talks about time. We must have time.

We have had time since 1954. We have been a wrongdoer since 1954. We have had all the time many, manifold, than any nation should need if it really wants to correct a wrong course of action.

The Senator talks about our objectives in South Vietnam. I will state to the Senator from Wisconsin that in the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon they are not as lilywhite as he would have us believe from his rhetorical questions.

The Senator has also heard me say many times on the floor of the Senate that I am satisfied that the major top policymakers in the Pentagon are aiming at preventive war against China. That is what they are after. The President should call them off—and quickly.

The Senator from Wisconsin has heard me say many times during the past 2 years since that the first demonstration of nuclear power on the part of Red China that we have those in the Pentagon who wish to bomb those Chinese nuclear installations. The Senator has heard me say that when we do I am satisfied that Red China will come in. They have no alternative. The Senator has heard me say that I am satisfied that Red Russia will come in, and when Red Russia comes in they will not pick China as the battlefield for her war.

The great danger is that the President of the United States and his advisers are leading the United States to the brink of total war. The American people had better recognize it before it is too late.

Mr. President, I do not like to find myself in such complete disagreement with my friend the Senator from Wisconsin, or with my President, but I feel that I have a solemn trust to continue to do what I can do to change the course of action of the United States from one of warmaking, which is unconscionable and illegal, to one of peacekeeping, which would accrue to the everlasting historic credit of this generation.

I do not believe the United States should continue to allow its projections of the views of others guide our policy at the United Nations. Our treaty obligations are a far more binding guide than the views of North Vietnam, or even the potential veto of the Soviet Union.

I think the objectors to U.N. action also ignore the interest Russia itself has in confining the Vietnam war. A peace mission, sent to Vietnam to keep the peace, could be as useful to the Soviet Union as to the rest of the world. A peace mission to Vietnam would have much the same role as it has had in the

Middle East, in the Congo, and in Cyprus. Its function would be to pacify; but if it were attacked or its peacekeeping operations threatened by any party, it would shoot back. That should be its function in South Vietnam. If such a mission could be established, it would be a great improvement over the current "pacification" whereby American troops are going to fight the Vietcong while the South Vietnamese forces try to establish government control behind the lines.

That kind of operation, which is the arrangement advocated by General Ky, only means that Americans will bear the brunt of the fighting, kill the villagers along with the Vietcong, bring in our B-52 heavy bombers for their indiscriminate support value, and provide an umbrella for General Ky and his feeble army to establish themselves in the rear.

Do the Senator from Wisconsin and the Washington Post want to call that kind of war preferable to a United Nations mission? I do not doubt that deaths will occur even among a peacekeeping operation. They occurred in the Congo. But there was a vast difference between the rebels in the Congo fighting the United Nations and rebels in the Congo fighting American troops sent in to prop up a government of our own choosing.

The plain fact is that South Vietnam is in no better condition to govern itself than was the Congo. It has many more elements of leadership that could develop into a meaningful government; but at the present time, it cannot furnish a government and it has not furnished one out of its own resources for 10 years.

South Vietnam should be a United Nations protectorate. It should be policed by a United Nations force to maintain peace and order until such time as a reunification election can be held or some other political disposition made of its future.

I am not impressed by any of the excuses that have been offered by the administration, by the press, or on the Senate floor for the continued flouting of the United Nations Charter. I find it a shocking and appalling situation when the United States of America announces itself embarked on a war in which we have undergone no attack whatever, a war 8,000 miles from our own shores, and in which American security interests are not at stake, without so much as a nod at the United Nations Charter. What a travesty upon the efforts of those who believed an Atlantic Charter and a United Nations was an essential political objective of World War II. What a repudiation of the principles we have preached for 20 years. What a deplorable precedent we are setting for the other nations of the world, whom we constantly implore to follow our example.

Sukarno's Indonesia left the United Nations when it found the organization no longer served its international purposes. The Soviet Union has stalked out from time to time when displeased by U.N. actions. But the United States merely calls it impractical and engages in war without reference to its charter.

Is it possible that the American people are prepared to see their Government

continue to escalate such a war without ever demanding that we live up to the U.N. Charter? Is it possible that our people will support an American war in Asia that is prosecuted by us just as though the United Nations was never created? I find that there is an increasing outcry among our population that we have pushed the Vietnam war far enough, and that it is time to live up to some of the international obligations we undertook 20 years ago in order to control future wars.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks correspondence I have received in just the last week on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN IN SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my trip across the country and back since I spoke on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy. I have heard the word "impeach" used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur. I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment.

Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case.

I do not think that those of us who want this administration to succeed in its objectives of peace and prosperity should be thinking of going home when it is coming under such fire as that. The President and his administration are going to need all the help and advice they can get from Congress on Vietnam this fall. It is time they gave ear to the views of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Montana, who apparently finally got the word through to the White House that there is a lot more acquiescence than genuine support in Congress for the Vietnam war. The Democratic Party has put up a verbal facade to protect a President of its own party. It has muted or stifled its criticism, except for a few voices like mine and that of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

But the facade is very close to cracking. When the welfare of the Nation is at stake, the desire to keep up appearances is less controlling than the desire to keep the Nation from making a ghastly mistake.

Members of Congress of both parties will serve their President a lot better by being here to tell him the truth than by adjourning and leaving his ears to the exclusive talk of the McNamaras and the Lodges and the Bundys and the Rusks and the other architects of Asian policy

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18421

who dug us into this pit in the first place. The President's advisers on Vietnam have a frightening record of having been wrong over and over again about the situation in that unfortunate country. They have misled the President and they have misled the country. Their estimates of the situation have been wrong, and their prescriptions of what to do about it have been wrong.

Congress could do no worse than they have done. And in fact, we would serve the President better by open and honest debate on Vietnam than we have served him by going along, sight unseen, with whatever the McNamara-Lodge-Bundy cabal has proposed. As the war worsens, and as the additional 50,000 soldiers are sent to Vietnam, and as the draft calls go up, the criticism of the President is going to increase. He will need friends in Congress then, and he will need some advisers who, like the Senators from Georgia and Montana, have a perspective on American interests that is lacking among the White House advisers.

The American people respect the views of these Members of Congress, and the administration would do well to attend to them, as well.

This is no time for Congress to take a walk, and leave the war up to the President. We should remain in session until January 1.

We should never overlook the fact that under the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the solemn obligation to function as an effective check upon the President and the executive branch of the Government. The President, too, has his checks upon Congress. But in my judgment, with American boys dying in Vietnam, Congress cannot justify any sine die adjournment.

EXHIBIT 1

CORVALLIS, OREG.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me tell you that I fully support your stand on Vietnam and am glad some others are now seeing the light. Enclosed is an article of mine on the subject.

It is my understanding that whatever commitment we have to the Vietnam Government is an Executive commitment. There has been no treaty with the advice and consent of the Senate. Is this not correct? Furthermore weren't whatever commitments which have been made made with disregard of the Senate and national sense of disapproval of any involvement in Vietnam about 1954?

Also, could you tell me what effect President Johnson's speech before the U.N. in June has in bringing this issue before the U.N.? What further steps need to be taken on the part of the U.S. Government?

Sincerely,

KERMIT J. ROHDE.

P.S.—If you have any good suggestions as to what further I can do to support you in this matter, let me have them.

[From the Oregon State University Daily Barometer, May 19, 1965]

VIETNAM QUESTIONS

(By Kermit Rohde, professor of psychology)

What are some of the questions which could and should be asked about Vietnam?

First, what is our purpose for being in Vietnam?

That we must honor our commitment to the South Vietnamese governments is not an answer. The Government to which we made this commitment was overthrown, not legally changed, and many subsequent changes by force have occurred. The original government itself became illegal when it refused to hold free elections in 1956 and thereby to carry out the 1954 Geneva agreement terms under which it was established. Furthermore we committed ourselves publicly to nations of the world to uphold the Geneva agreement which requires us not to interfere in Vietnam.

That we are fighting for freedom is not an answer. During the 1954-58 period when there was peace in Vietnam, we stood firmly behind the Diem government as it abolished a 40-year old tradition of electing village chiefs. President Eisenhower and Diem scuttled the holding of free elections on a nationwide basis in 1956 as planned in the Geneva Awards. Since then the governments that have been formed have been military dictatorships overt or covert. Our Diem regime, the only one which had a peaceful period in which to work, was the most cruel and repressive, especially of religious freedoms.

Do we fight for the people of Vietnam?

The reason General Eisenhower gave for overthrowing the planned elections in 1956 was that 80 percent would vote against those we wanted to rule. There is evidence that even the Vietnamese Army is against us. Eighty percent of the arms of the Vietcong come from the United States much of this as a near gift from the Vietnamese Army. As testified by U.S. military men, the Vietnamese have used such delivery tactics as marching into jungles, carefully laying down their arms and running when a shot is fired at them.

Furthermore Vietcong fights a guerrilla war. It is generally conceded that one cannot fight a guerrilla war without a friendly populace. As Mao, the Chinese expert puts it, "The guerrilla must be able to move among friendly people as fish in a sea." How is it possible that huge supplies sufficient to sustain Vietcong forces which are strongest around Saigon are obtainable? Saigon at a minimum is 500 miles from North Vietnam, the nearest friendly source. Needn't there be local friends for direct contributions or to facilitate transport?

It seems unlikely that the Vietnamese are cooperative with Vietcong through force. The greatest use of force and terror in our time, that by the Nazis and the Japanese, did not make unfriendly European and Asian peoples cooperative during World War II.

The answer that we are fighting communism brings up other questions. Is it true that the elected president of the Vietcong, Nguyen Huu Tho, never has been a Communist, and that only one of his vice presidents has been a Communist? Are we to militarily oppose communism everywhere? Are we to militarily engage all types of communism, the Russian, the Chinese, the Yugoslav, the North Vietnamese type, the Cuban Marxism? Why only Vietnam now?

The answer that the safety of our Nation brings up other questions. President Eisenhower stated that the price of his famous settlement of the Korean dispute was the loss of southeast Asia including Vietnam. If the loss of Vietnam makes our Nation powerless in its own defense, did President Eisenhower sell his country down the river for a political advantage or has the importance of Vietnam changed? If it has changed what has brought about this change?

Just exactly and specifically what is the great harm which will occur if we do not control a nation on the other side of the earth? If Vietnam is really the key to our

safety, what will we do should we lose it? Dissolve our Nation? Pull back to the Hawaiian Islands? Pull back to the Pacific Ocean?

The second major question one could ask is, How practicable is our present plan?

We are bombing North Vietnam. Why? The March 1965 white paper of the U.S. Government simply supports earlier estimates that the Vietcong was mainly a South Vietnam movement at that time—only 10 to 20 percent of the aid comes from outside. Almost all of the captured soldiers mentioned, though trained in the north, are native born South Vietnamese.

Can North Vietnam force the war to stop?

North Vietnam did use its influence to get warfare to cease in the south during the 1954-58 period by selling the Vietcong on the idea that 1956 free elections would be held as promised by the United States and others. After this betrayal, can the north again sell the Vietcong on the good faith of the United States or anyone associated with it?

Furthermore, the known morale effects of strategic bombing, ever since the Spanish civil war, are to create opposition and to harden it. The military effects are negligible. Analysis of World War II strategic bombing shows that it contributed negligibly to military victory. In North Korea, 1950-52, the only effect of bombing was to demoralize the U.S. Air Force involved. I knew those airmen well. Indeed Secretary Bundy admitted recently on "Meet the Press" that bombing has had no visible effect on the war. The present allegations that North Vietnamese regulars are now fighting indicate that it may have had the predictable effect of making the war more difficult for the United States.

To fight against guerrilla war takes a ratio of 10 to 15 to 1. On Malaya, it took 350,000 troops 13 years to win against 8,000 guerrillas. One-fourth of the officers in the U.S. ground forces are now involved in this war.

If we involve North Vietnam, is it to be noted that North Vietnam has an army twice the size that Japan had in southeast Asia during World War II. Are we going to continue to tie up these large military forces in Vietnam? Will we want to do so for many years?

Vietnam has had a 1,000-year-old tradition of resisting China. Ho Chi Minh, the leader of North Vietnam, has spent years in a Red Chinese prison. There are 16 million people in North Vietnam. Isn't it possible for such a group to remain independent of Red China as it is for little Finland with only 4 million to remain free of the Soviet Union? Isn't it possible that our bombing or further attacking of North Vietnam will weaken the will to resist Red China and enable Red China to enter and control North Vietnam?

It is to be noted here that though there is general agreement that Red China is happier than we over the fight the Vietcong puts up, no responsible authority, even our Government who has every reason to do so, contends and offers evidence that Red China controls North Vietnam or the Vietcong. In short aren't we operating to extend Red Chinese control in southeast Asia? As Chou En-Lai said "Once we worried about southeast Asia. We don't any more. The Americans are rapidly solving our problems for us."

Besides these practical questions there are legal and moral questions such as where would we stand with regard to the principles used for judgment at the Nuremberg trials? But these I leave for others.

These are merely some of the questions which could and should be asked and to which I would like answers and some straight answers.

18422

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

[From the Oregon State University Daily
Barometer, May 19, 1965]

INHUMANE WAR?

(By Amos Roos, 1965, engineering)

The war we are pursuing in Vietnam is even more inhumane than wars usually are. Prisoners of war are tortured in most ingenious ways, barbaric beyond comprehension. Whole villages are napalmed on the suspicion that they may shelter a few soldiers of the Vietcong. At our prompting, the Saigon Government has established "strategic hamlets," guarded stockaded villages where whole populations, uprooted from their homes, are forced to live in virtual concentration camps. Intellectuals who speak out for peace are exiled.

Perhaps actions as reprehensible as these are undertaken by the Vietcong as well; perhaps they are carried out by Vietnamese personnel and not by Americans. Nonetheless, we are responsible. Torture cannot be justified as revenge or reprisal for damage done to us; the napalm, regardless of who drops it, was furnished by you and me, the American taxpayer.

Once upon a time, such a war was not considered civilized; but Hitler has taught us to kill vast numbers of civilians on the chance that, among them, there might be one soldier. The war we are waging in Vietnam is obscenely immoral.

The American position in Vietnam cannot be defended on moral grounds. In the policies of the Johnson administration, I regret to note, justice and morality are no longer at issue. We are not in the Dominican Republic to see justice done, or human lives saved, or to support any moral law. Our purpose is political. We are there to stop communism.

In Vietnam, likewise, our purpose is not to help the people attain a fuller life. It is to stop the "spread of communism," and to retain our "hold" on a piece of land whose strategic importance is highly debatable.

Perhaps our present position in Vietnam can be justified from a political standpoint, since it clearly cannot be justified from a moral or ethical one. If our presence there brings about results which, over the short and long term, are beneficial to the interests of the United States, then that presence may be considered worthwhile. If the ends justify the means, as they seem to for Johnson, we must ask whether the means employed are likely to lead to the desired ends.

What are the ends we seek in Vietnam? Do we seek to destroy the regime of Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi? His army is presently a great obstacle to Chinese incursions into Indochina. Do our policymakers seek to provoke the Chinese into a war so we can "let 'em have it"? Such a war, if it ever comes, will at best inflict terrible damage on both sides. It will probably become world war III.

Do we seek to destroy the fighting spirit of the Vietcong so that a strong and stable government may be established in South Vietnam? If so, the people of Vietnam will remain divided, arbitrarily at the 17th parallel.

As the record indicates, there is little hope that a stable government could be established in the south. And the policies we are following are totally ineffective in destroying the Vietcong. The overwhelming proportion of their arms comes, not from Hanoi, but from the U.S. Army.

The men of the Vietcong are South Vietnamese, fighting to liberate their country from the American imperialism which in 1954 stalled Diem as its puppet ruler, in 1956 prevented free elections from taking place, and has been devoting ever more effort to ravishing their country.

Let us survey what consequences might result from our present policies in Vietnam.

Will we succeed in weakening the regime of Ho Chi Minh, the guerrilla leader who saved Vietnam from the Mao Tse-tung? Impossible: under threat from an outside enemy, a nation unites under its chosen leaders. Are we in Vietnam to demonstrate the advantages of a democratic form of government? Sure thing. We've already demonstrated half a dozen times in the last year and a half.

Will our present policies guarantee that the next Vietnamese Government will be friendly to us? Probably not. We are presently engaged in the destruction of their industrial base, such as it was (though we are building plenty of good airstrips), the disruption of their society, and the decimation of their population. Our army, virtually an army of occupation, and our vast expenditures of money foment profiteering and corruption in Saigon. And history has shown us no way to guarantee ourselves a "friendly" government. Though we may try to buy them with the offer of a billion-dollar Mekong Valley project, such loyalty as we may gain will be mixed with contempt.

Lyndon Johnson seeks peace in Vietnam. In 1939, all Europeans wanted peace in Europe. Hitler wanted a peace in which Poland would be a part of Germany. England and France sought a peace under somewhat different conditions—and the peace was lost. A difference of opinions about the conditions of that peace helped lead to war. It is therefore of fundamental importance to know the conditions of peace which Johnson would accept.

Sooner or later, if world war III does not break out, there will have to be a truce in Indochina. How will it be maintained? Who will police it? If a force of Vietnamese, under whose command? If an international force, how would it be financed? Would it be possible to set up such a force under such circumstances that countries such as France, the United States, and the Soviet Union would all be willing to contribute their share of the cost?

Under what kind of government might Vietnam then carry on? If a neutral government, how could the situation be maintained? Because any government which Ho did not consider reactionary, Johnson would certainly view as Communist. Perhaps the solution would lie in the creation of a trust territory under the U.N. But what country's trusteeship would be acceptable to all the powers concerned?

The war in Vietnam cannot possibly cease until such questions as I have raised have been thoroughly discussed. So far, they have scarcely been raised.

ASPEN, COLO.,
July 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a former Oregonian I am proud because of your courageous opposition against our unwise involvement in Vietnam. I should have told you this much earlier but I was mixed up and tried hard to believe that we are doing the right thing. However the more I study the question, the less defensible our position appears to me, even when viewed solely from the angle of power politics.

Very sincerely yours,

A. E. BRETTAUER.

SALEM, OREG.,
July 22, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record, as one who has thought for months, that it was past time for us to take the Vietnam problem to the United Nations. I and many

people who are confused, but may not write, will be grateful if you use all your influence to use the one and only hope (U.N.) to keep us from being carried down the road to annihilation.

Respectfully,

LILLIAN I. ANDERSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please do all in your power to halt the fighting in Vietnam.

I do not see how the President can keep sending troops there, when we are not at war. We were only supposed to show them how to use our equipment. No wonder they look on us as aggressors.

If our men must fight give them every weapon. We have no business to do less. These men who are dying are precious to us. I do not see how our leader has the right to draft men and send them to war, when we have not declared war.

May God forgive us.

I pray God will guide you and help you to show others where they are wrong. May He bless your fine work, we need more like you in our Government.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JESSE HACKWORTH.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
July 21, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State Capitol Building,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard an unbelievable story the other day. It concerned something that the mayor of Mexicali said to Chou En-lai and the Chinese people.

It seems that the fighting has been raging furiously around La Paz and Ensenada in Baja California. Gringo-equipped banditos from northern Baja California have penetrated across the desert south of Pozo Grande and Santo Domingo to threaten La Paz itself, and a posse of southern Baja Californians (with Chinese advisers) are chasing the banditos up and down their mountainous retreats in the Sierra de la Giganta while the Chinese Air Force carries out daily bombing raids to the north, knocking out the casino and resorts at Ensenada and the chamber of commerce, branches of U.S. banks, and greenback concessions in Tijuana.

From the capital city of Mexicali, just below the California border, the northern government has issued a statement to all Baja Californians, but pointedly addressed to the La Paz government of the south. The great Mexican people, it reminded them, share a common heritage of democracy. Born in the revolutionary days of Zapata there has been a fierce love of liberty throughout the land, and a process of change which has seen the growth of education and a consequent evolution toward responsible, enlightened democracy and greater and greater individual independence. The statement then charged that the Emperor of La Paz was a heel-dragger. Balking mulishly against the hands of change, he was holding his people back in their democratic growth—all under the guise of benevolent fatherhood—and that to save this benevolent fatherhood (which was nothing more than a selfish little monarchy in fear of all threats to its fatty status quo of conquistadores and Indians) he had put on a mask of Communist aspirations and had beseeched the Chinese to save him from the aggression of gringo commercialism. Ah, but what is more ridiculous than descendants of Zapata kowtowing to coercion—to Mao Tse-tung's tyranny of pseudoscientific economic determinism, which itself must change one day? Measured against the proud palomero of our native heritage, the communique con-

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18423

cluded, no foreign influence can hope to stand higher than the eye of a lizard.

From the Emperor of La Paz there were only the briefest of statements. In an interview with the Chinese people's daily TV, he said that his people were all Marxist-Leninists at heart, were born and bred in dialectical materialism, and only needed to be kept free from gringo commercialism in order to build a showplace Communist utopia amidst the cactus and gila monsters of the Territorio del Sur. The Emperor ended on a note of humility, offering his selfless services as a servant of destiny and of the people. Chou En-lai ended the interview, assuring the Emperor of the Chinese people's selfless and continuing support. The riches of the Vizcaino desert and the heart longings toward Marxism-Leninism of the progressive people of La Paz must not fall to the greedy commercialism of the gringos and their lackeys in Mexicali, he said. Ending on a similar note of humility, he reiterated that the Chinese people's purpose in bombing Ensenada was only to defend Peiping and the Communist world and that their stay in Baja California was only for the temporary purpose of fighting the gringo aggressors from Mexicali and protecting all of Mexico for communism.

What was ungraciously unbelievable was what the mayor of Mexicali replied to Chou En-lai. Heartily backed by Lyndon Johnson and the U.S. Army, he replied that he and his people would fight against the pirates from China "for 20 years and longer."

Yours sincerely,

EDWARD N. HUGGINS,
Department of English,
Southern Oregon College.

JULY 24, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When you stated, earlier this year, that by the end of 1965 hundreds of thousands of Americans would be dying in Vietnam, I thought you were probably exaggerating to make a point. The events of the past few days have shown me that, as usual, you were right, your critics wrong. It has become obvious that no action is too insane for President Johnson. I think I know now how many Germans must have felt during the latter part of the thirties. As many Germans must have done, I tell myself that no one is heinous enough to order the murder of women and children, that no one is mad enough to begin a war over a Boy Scout concept of "honor." Nevertheless, the newspapers, the television, and the radio all join in telling me that precisely this is happening.

Also like many Germans, I discover that I do not have the courage of whatever it takes to meaningfully oppose this idiocy. No, I will not refuse to serve in the Armed Forces; if asked, I will even join in the murder of Vietnamese women and children. Like Adolf Eichmann, I will "follow orders." My only wish is that bloodthirsty politicians would not ask me to believe in what I do. In short, I wish men whom I despise and for whom I feel nothing but contempt—men such as Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, and Dean Rusk—would cease mouthing empty platitudes and childish lies. Because if the American way of life can survive only on a base of colonialism, then I hope and pray that this society is destroyed as quickly as possible.

I should like now to congratulate you for what has been a gallant and inspiring fight. Sometimes a voice in the wilderness saves a society, sometimes it does not. In any event, if the human race has a future, history will justify your actions. As the war gets worse, American democracy, such as it is, will probably be replaced by a more efficient form of government. So, if you abandon your fight, I will not blame you. Good luck.

Yours truly,

MIKE MIKKELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 26, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I don't suppose this letter will be read by you, since I understand about 1 in 50 reaches your desk, the rest receiving polite acknowledgments from your secretaries, but I felt in view of the worsening Vietnam situation I had to write, feeling as I do that escalation of this war will provoke us into a major conflict with unforeseeable if not tragic consequences. Much as we would like to be the savior of all downtrodden countries and carry the shining banner of democracy into every land, realistically we are not going to be able to carry out such a mission, and it is a big question whether democracy, in the present state of the world, is the answer for all nations.

Many people are questioning whether we can wipe out communism and play "Sir Galahad" to all our fellow men. It may be we will have to learn to coexist with Russia and Red China, protecting the interests of threatened Americans where trouble brews (as in Santo Domingo, until that situation mushroomed into a foolish and impossible crusade), but not extending hostilities into enemy territory. Our lines of supply are so far extended compared to the Chinese, in this Vietnam situation, to say nothing of the juggernaut of Chinese manpower, that we will really find ourselves "painted into a corner" and unable to get out if we bomb Hanoi and other Red Chinese bases. Maybe we could win eventually, who knows, but when the experts talk of the war continuing 10, 15, 20 years, in the holocaust of death and destruction, attrition and possible use of the atomic or hydrogen bombs by either side, the question of who wins is purely quixotic.

I often think nowadays of President Franklin Roosevelt's words: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." So many of us have become so hysterical about the Communist threat that we have lost all sense of proportion and prate about it as deluded parents do the bogeyman to frighten a child. It is the black plague, the Salem witchcraft hunt of our day. I, for one, get mighty tired of all these timid, frightened people who scurry around in the dark blind alleys of communism, like moles who have lost not only their sight but other senses as well. We can recognize it as an unquestioned threat to our way of life but we can meet it clear eyed and clear headed. I think much of this pumping up the high blood pressure of the Nation can be laid at the door of newspapers and periodicals, particularly Life and Time which thrive on sensationalism and the sometimes atrophied views of Mr. Henry Luce. For a refreshing contrast to this panic beating of the war drums by such publications, read George Feifer's excellent article "Communism Is Not What We Think" in the Saturday Evening Post's "Speaking Out" section for February 27, 1965, and Frederick Nossal's "Dateline—Peiping," published in 1962.

Dear Mr. Johnson, I think you are a fine and dedicated President; we voted for you and have every confidence in your great abilities but I think some of your advisers are leading you astray when they propose stepping up the war and sending ever more and more American boys over there. The bombing of villages, of helpless women and children, is not only blackening the image of the United States in foreign eyes, but a grave sin on our own collective soul. When we can argue the necessary successful outcome of any war on the number of human beings killed, whatever sex or age, combatants or noncombatants, we have fallen low indeed. I never approved the bombing of Hiroshima or Nagasaki despite the military

arguments designed to salve the national conscience and I am heartsick about the war in Vietnam. If we have to "lose face" to get out or negotiate, better it be now than in some near or distant future when we have committed ourselves too far to ever withdraw.

Most sincerely yours,

MARGARET MOZZANINI.

CC: Hon. EDITH GREEN
Hon. WAYNE MORSE

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 28, 1965.

Hon. President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

HON. PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Your message to the American people asking for a doubling of the draft leaves me appalled. How can our Nation call for action on two fronts—seemingly contradictory—the waging of a wider war, as indicated by an increase in the military manpower being sent from our country to Vietnam and at the same time an appeal to United Nations Secretary U Thant "requesting that all the resources, energy and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and bring peace in Vietnam."

I sit in attendance at a 1-week institute on teaching disadvantaged children. For what do we want to prepare these children? Don't we want manpower to help our country and the world reach new heights of achievement for world peace? How do we do this when we are faced with pronouncements which seem to give greater value to possibilities of greater destruction of mankind.

Our Nation, one of the great powers in the world in intellectual and other areas of achievement, should be giving greater leadership to efforts for disarmament and total world peace. I ask this of you, Mr. President. Let us not live with the lie that says the waging of a wider war is a true pursuit of peace.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN L. GORDON,
Mrs. William Gordon.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel compelled to write to you on the recent developments in the southeast Asian controversy. As a student I feel that the only way to a settlement at all is through the United Nations. I feel that the recent draft increase that the President has called is unquestionably an act of aggression on the part of the United States of America, and is therefore an act of war. For this reason I feel that the President has clearly overstepped his authority.

As you may well know President Johnson becomes very upset when he is criticized, but I feel that it is about time that he was brought under fire by more people than yourself. I would like to also tell you that I am proud that you represent me on the floor of the Senate.

Being a student I realize that the recent decisions of the Johnson administration will no doubt affect me much more than I realize at this time, and I would serve faithfully in any post that I might get placed in should I get called up by the Army. However, I must say in all honesty that had I been old enough to vote in 1964 I would have voted for Johnson because of his apparent stand on southeast Asian policy, but in 1968 I will be old enough to vote and I shall not vote for anyone who runs under the same colored flag that he ran under in 1964. Johnson has broken his faith with the public and if he feels that appointing Mr.

18424

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

Lodge to Mr. Taylor's job in Saigon will curb criticism he's really on the wrong trail.

I hope that every young man and woman that will be affected by our Government's recent shift in hit and miss policy to more of the same, will write to their representatives and let them know how they feel on the subject of U.S. aggression in southeast Asia.

Respectfully yours,
DONALD JAMES NELSON.

HALFWAY, OREG.,
July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: From the reports we have had this week you, as well as many others, are being consulted about the war in South Vietnam.

First, we would like to tell you that we are proud of the way you have expressed your opinions about the situation and we are supporting you all the way when you say we should pull out of that part of the world. After careful consideration it appears to us that we are not wanted by these people—that is with the exception of a few at the expense of many. In the first place it was our understanding that it would be for a short time to advise and keep the peace until they could have an election—which never happened. Then it was supplies and a few men and now many more men to fight and die for a cause even they do not understand the meaning of. We believe in a free government and would like to see the people of Vietnam free to choose their leaders and have the right to rule themselves as they see fit, but are we imposing our opinions on them so that they find that we are not the welcome guests that we would be led to believe—or are supposed to be? Why are we getting more and more involved in a situation that is so complicated and why are we afraid to lose face? Is it not more important to save the lives of our young men than to say we have saved face and let so many die in a cause that we should never have entered into?

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. LEWIS LAIRD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

The OREGONIAN,
Portland, Oreg.
To the Editor:

The Oregonian has performed a vital public role in giving front page space in its July 19 issue to the article by AP staff writer John T. Wheeler. Most Americans must feel both angry and ashamed of what we are doing in Vietnam in the name of freedom. The London Daily Mirror reports of a July 4 interview with Air Force General Ky, now head of the South Vietnamese Government. Asked who his heroes were, he replied: "I have only one, Hitler." In this dirty, unprincipled war Hitler seems an appropriate hero to the General but is he to be our hero as well?

Have we lost all reason, all sense of proportion and all human conscience that we can continue to devastate a country in an attempt to save a government which lacks any support from its own people? If this senseless slaughter is allowed to continue in the name of the American people we will certainly go down in history side by side with those tyrannical powers who knew no moral concern. Even beyond this, the continuation of the war in Vietnam threatens to escalate into a total holocaust engulfing not only South Vietnam, North Vietnam, and China, but the United States itself. Is it so difficult for us to imagine the wailing Vietnamese woman cradling a baby in her arms—pictured with Mr. Wheeler's article—to be an American mother cradling an Amer-

ican baby midst the ruins of a once happy country?

Time is running out and the American must protest in every conceivable way the continuation of this senseless, fruitless and ill-conceived war. Negotiations through the United Nations are the only alternative and no excuses can substitute for immediate action to end this tragedy. Senator Morse has repeated time and time again the procedures open to the Government of the United States if it truly wants to end this fiasco. Within the last few days, Governor Hatfield has called for an immediate convening of the United Nations to deal with ending this horror. Both men deserve our thanks and support.

All Americans, of every religious conviction, of every ethical persuasion, of every political conviction—in the name of humanity and its future—have the urgent task to convince our Government to order an immediate cease-fire and to enter into negotiations for a political settlement through the United Nations.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HOWARD L. GLAZER.

cc: President Lyndon B. Johnson,
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Governor Mark O. Hatfield.

WEST LINN, OREG.
July 25, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing clippings I think you may enjoy.

I trust you won't consent to our President sending more men and boys to be slaughtered in Vietnam, without full knowledge and consent of the House and Senate majority O.K.

I feel the President and Attorney General, and Mr. McNamara have too much authority. We do have other minds worthy of consideration don't you?

Sincerely,

Mrs. BOBBY SCHEER.

HILLSBORO, OREG.,
July 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last weekend we heard a radio report that you were preparing a paper in hopes of taking the Vietnam problem (war) to the U.N. I've searched the papers since and cannot find one line regarding this. I'm beginning to think we have a very well controlled press.

All I could say was "Bless you," please continue that line of thought and speak out loud and long and do all in your power to try for a settlement of the horrible southeast Asia mess. Somehow the citizens must be made to realize that American boys' lives are being sacrificed every day for them.

One does not need a degree in military science to see the mistake of getting involved in Vietnam, unless the Government is prepared to fight Red China backed by Russia which could mean a war continuing many, many years. China has been preparing for this expansion for years with her 2 million troops in uniform. Why does the Government feel we have to convince the South Vietnamese that they should live in a democracy when their government has been unable to do it for the last 10 years? Why are we so concerned that they not be communist controlled, when we did so little to prevent it in Cuba? I realize that communism must be contained but at least we could begin in a country that makes an effort to defend themselves. Our Government does not seem concerned when Communist members and even college professors are permitted to speak and influence our young people, who in turn, belittle democracy and defy our government by burning their draft cards.

We have spent billions on the U.N. and that is the one place the Vietnam question must be discussed to find out just who is wrong. Where are our allies? We can't even depend on our good neighbor, Canada, who right now is supplying Red China with much needed supplies. They must feel that we are wrong and want no part of it. France knows we are wrong, and if nothing else, we should have gained a lesson from their sad and costly mistake. England can offer nothing but moral support, knowing our troops will be a buffer for them in Malaya and relieve the pressure on them. So our allies, little Australia and South Korea send a token of troops, and our boys, the cream of manhood between 22 and 30, will be killed by the thousands when Red China completes their missile bases in North Vietnam. That doesn't make sense to me.

We have been given the impression by the press that we have to liberate the South Vietnamese from the Communists, but tonight an article in the Journal says: "Taylor and the South Vietnamese officials were inside the stadium attending a rally marking the creation of a new movement to liberate North Vietnam from Communist control." If that is attempted, just who are the aggressors?

Now they tell us that the Reserves and the National Guard must be called up. Do you realize what that means? Thousands of young men who have worked hard for several years to secure a job, have married and many with small children, are to be told to give up everything and go to a seething jungle to kill and be killed. Is that the true meaning of the Great Society we hear about from President Johnson, who also said during his campaign that he would not send troops to Vietnam. That meant many votes for him because we wanted to believe him. We are sick to death of war with every Democratic President in office.

What will become of the families of these men? In most cases they will lose their homes, for certainly the salary of the lowly enlisted man is not sufficient to maintain a home. The Government seems so concerned with the war on poverty, Job Corps training and all the underprivileged groups, I wonder how concerned it will be when these families lose their husbands and daddies.

What is hardest of all to understand is this draft call. Until the late President Kennedy decided no married men should be drafted, all young men physically able had a military obligation to fulfill. Now it seems all they have to do is produce a marriage license and they are immune to even 6 months' training. We have seen it happen all around us. Right out of high school or maybe a few years in college, but at least before that draft board calls, that marriage license is the next step, and they are laughing up their sleeves at the "suckers," as they call them, who got drafted.

What is fair about all these so-called students, and the troublemakers we find at every coastal resort, and the black jacket crowd and beatniks, do they not owe anything in the way of military service? It's terribly hard to see them roam the streets and highways and our young family men obligated to give 4 to 6 years and maybe their lives. For we know it will be a terrible price they will have to pay once they are sent to fight the Vietcong guerrillas with the little training they have received in the Reserves. My cousin fought in New Guinea in World War II and because of 8 years' service in the Marines he lived to come home but he said it was pure murder to send in such inexperienced men as the Reserves and Guards.

Again, please do all in your power to get this dispute before the U.N. so at least we could find out if we have any allies and if they are as interested in containing communism as our Government would like us to believe. Our belief is that they are not, or

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18425

Cuba and Red China would have been boycotted before now. We wonder, too, why our other Senator and Representatives from Oregon have been so silent on such a vital (life or death to many) matter.

Respectfully,

Mrs. W. H. HATHORN.

P.S.—We assume because of the untimely death of our Ambassador Stevenson your purpose will be delayed, but continue to persist. If you are successful in this mission, there is small doubt but that you could be our next President by popular demand.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Recognizing gravity current situation, mindful of Nation's welfare and world responsibilities, and awful dangers of escalation, we urge thorough discussion by Senate of Vietnam policy including need for limiting U.S. intervention to holding defensible positions, halting bombing of North Vietnam to facilitate negotiation, seeking a cease fire agreement by every effective avenue multilateral diplomacy, and negotiating with all parties involved.

Bishop A. RAYMOND GRANT,
President,

Bishop CHARLES F. GOLDEN,
Vice President,

Dr. A. DUDLEY WARD,
General Secretary Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

Deeply opposed to any further escalation to the war in Vietnam.

MARTHA B. FOLEY,
MARGARET SMITH,

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly feel Vietnam problem should be brought before U.N.

CHARLES W. PETERSEN,
BETTY M. PETERSEN,

JOHN DAY, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am increasingly alarmed at decreasingly justifiable position of United States in Asia. Believe it imperative to stop escalation, define objectives clearly and publicly, face realities of Taiwan, establish diplomatic communication with China, and make fullest use of United Nations despite difficulties, seeking all possible avenues toward peace before too late.

M. T. MERRILL, M.D.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge support your continued efforts for peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

CHARLES AND ELEANOR DAVIS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Why can't you elect Members in your caucus to effectively disallow the administration's current policies in Vietnam that will

have the effect of repudiating them. Public sentiment will support you gentlemen.

JOHN R. STAFFORD.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
July 25, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the questioning on Vietnam. I noticed the Monitor had an article saying that some Senate critics had been virtually silenced by the pressure that criticism was now unpatriotic and un-American. I want you to know I do not think that, and I hope you will be able to continue your questioning.

If you are in Oregon this fall, I would like for you to share your thinking with us.

Sincerely,

PAUL F. DAVIS.

EUGENE, OREG.

The Honorable Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am the mother of two sons; therefore I am quite concerned as to the reports of the situation in Vietnam and the stand of President Johnson and others.

I protest wholeheartedly about sending our boys to fight, especially when we have such little knowledge of why we are there.

With sincere hope you will do all you can to pass on more information to the people of Oregon.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. FRED M. BROWN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with your views on the conflict in Vietnam, as expressed in your latest Senate speech, completely.

Yours truly,

Mrs. A. W. STEPHENSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was glad to see on the television screen your views on Vietnam. Please be assured of our wholehearted support and please keep on working for peace.

Yours sincerely,

MARGARET ROBINSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is merely a brief note from one of your constituents and supporters who wishes to express his admiration for your logical views concerning Vietnam. I only wish more policy-makers felt the same way.

Sincerely,

ROBERT STAVER.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a word to say how glad I am someone is unafraid to speak out against the lack of wisdom in the handling of the Vietnam crisis. I am sure in the events that so surely lie ahead of all of us that you will be thankful to have been among the counted who would have sought solution, where it properly belonged, with the United Nations.

Unfortunately wisdom and enlightenment is seldom shared by the majority * * * therefore your responsibility is even heavier. Would that our governing leaned more to wisdom and less to politics.

My best wishes to you and all who share the burden of decisions in these trying times.

Sincerely,

BLANCHE TUCKER.

P.S.—The Job Corps seems to be making excellent use of the Tongue Point facility.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your forceful stand against the present policy on southeast Asia. Please continue the good work.

Sincerely,

JOHN MALONE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 28, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: I completely support you in your opposition to our activities in Vietnam. I urge you to devote your complete time to influencing other Senators and Congressmen as well as the press and public toward an end to this futile slaughter.

With deepest concern,

HOLLY M. HART.

CAMMER & SHAPIRO,

New York, N.Y., July 30, 1965.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: I am writing to express my dismay at the silence of Senators like yourself and Mr. Kennedy over the abdication by Congress of its sole responsibility to decide whether or not the country is to be at war in the face of the usurpation of that responsibility by the President.

Article I, clause 11 of the Constitution is explicit that Congress alone has the constitutional "power * * * to declare war," and under clauses 12 and 13 only Congress has constitutional authority " * * * to raise and support armies" and " * * * to provide and maintain a Navy."

It is thus clear that the Constitution imposes a tight rein upon the President's participation in deciding whether or not to declare war. The Constitution provides that Congress alone must make that decision.

"Nothing in our Constitution is plainer than the declaration of war is entrusted only to Congress." *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 642 (1952).

The sole responsibility of Congress for this decision is further emphasized by the fact that the Constitution does not provide that Congress should declare war "on recommendation of the President," or that the "President with advice and consent of Congress may declare war." As former Assistant Secretary of State James Grafton Rogers has observed: "The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative." Rogers, "World Policing and the Constitution," p. 21 (Boston, 1945).

The proceedings of the Constitutional Convention make clear that the Founding Fathers were not only determined to deny a war-making power to the President, but were even unwilling to entrust it to the Senate alone. To assure the fullest consideration of these fateful decisions they therefore provided that the entire Congress, including the House of Representatives should participate in the decision. Bemis, "The Diplomacy of the American Revolution" (New York, 1935), pp. 29-35. See also, Morris, "The Era of the American Revolution" (1939), p. 140-169.

Despite this constitutional separation of powers, the country and the world were subjected, by the President's East Room press conference on July 28, to the spectacle of an executive declaration of war. The President did not even trouble to characterize our involvement as a "police action;" he boldly declared not only that we were and would be at war, but presumed to decide and to declare the extent to which we would commit troops and other forces in that war.

I submit that this flouting of the Constitution is the destruction of the form and substance of constitutional government. No justification appears for this disregard of the basic separation of powers which is fundamental to our form of government. Con-

gress is and has been in session; the situation in Vietnam has been in the making for many years; no sudden emergency or unexpected developments have arisen which might remotely justify unilateral executive action. It is wholly unfitting for the President to exercise powers which are vested solely in the Congress. As Chief Justice Warren pointed out as recently as June 7, 1965 (quoting James Madison):

"The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

United States v. Brown, — U.S. —, 33 LW 4603.

Nor are the President's closed discussions with "leaders" of Congress an adequate substitute for congressional action. Under a government of laws, action must be taken lawfully through the constitutionally established institutions of government—in this case by Congress—and in a constitutional manner. Congress acts as a Congress when it acts in a parliamentary manner and with opportunity to debate and deliberate, not in closed meetings with a few over breakfast or otherwise.

"With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preserving free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations."

Mr. Justice Jackson, concurring in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company v. Sawyer*, supra, 655 (1952).

The President has indicated that he is reluctant to ask Congress for a declaration of war lest any opposition to his policies, even if by a small minority, might give aid and comfort to the enemy. This, of course, does not justify his usurpation of powers which are solely in the Congress and not in himself.

But even if it were, it is worthwhile to recall that when he was Democratic leader of the Senate during the administration of President Eisenhower, Mr. Johnson rejected such factors as justifying the exclusion of Congress from the fateful decisionmaking in this area, and that he took this position in connection with an earlier, and perhaps more critical stage of the situation in Indochina.

For on May 6, 1954, it was Mr. Johnson who broke the bipartisanship which had theretofore and since the war characterized American foreign policy. On that day, according to the *New York Times* of May 7, 1954 (then) Senator Johnson, as Democratic leader of the Senate, launched an attack upon the administration's foreign policy and gave dual notice (1) that the bipartisanship of the last 16 months was breaking up, and (2) that the congressional Democrats could not be counted upon for unquestioned general support in the field of world affairs.

According to the *Times*, Senator Johnson and former President Harry S. Truman used the Jefferson-Jackson dinner on May 6, 1954, to lead off the attack by a declaration that the administration was alienating allies of the United States and that, according to Senator Johnson, the United States was in "clear danger of being left naked and alone in a hostile world."

Senator Johnson launched this attack at a time when the fall of Dienbienphu was imminent, and, in fact, it fell only a few days later. Nevertheless, he criticized the administration about the differences which he claimed it had developed with the traditional allies of the United States over Indochina and demanded that thereafter Congress should be consulted in advance on decisive issues of national security policy. He said:

"We will insist upon clear explanations of the policies in which we are asked to cooperate. We will insist that we and the American people be treated as adults—that we have the facts without sugar coating * * *"

At the same dinner, Senator Green asserted that the administration was "isolating ourselves from our friends about as fast as the administration can grind out new policy statements * * *". The administration blusters about massive retaliation, and our allies fear we are inviting war."

As you can discern, I deeply believe that our involvement in the current war in Vietnam is a tragic and perhaps fatal error. It is occurring despite all warnings that we should not become involved in a ground war in Asia. And it is occurring in the worst possible circumstances, for, as Walter Lippmann has pointed out, we are alone in our stand. The claim that we must honor our commitments is patently hollow. Not one of the nations we are presumably trying to save has seen fit to support us in this war, and, if anything, the indications are that they oppose our actions. This includes Indonesia, India, Malaya, Cambodia, Thailand, Laos; none of their troops are in the field with ours. Australia is not one of the "dominoes." Even the South Vietnam beneficiaries of our commitment have long since gone or are going (many of them over to the other side). We are thus fighting to help people who don't want our help, or at least not the kind of help—barbaric war—we are giving to them. Lawyers call this officious intermeddling, but here the potential consequences are more appalling.

I feel that you, as the senior Senator from New York and also as a member of an opposite political party from the President, have the greater opportunity and responsibility to speak up for constitutional government and thereby, in this case, to further the greater cause of world peace. Perhaps they are one and the same.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator KENNEDY with the hope that he, too, may see fit to join with you in opposing the President's usurpation of the function of Congress and to bring to end the self-destructive policy of Executive escalation of an unjustifiable and dangerous war.

I am also sending copies to Senators MORSE and GRUENING, to whom, in my humble opinion, the Nation owes a massive debt for their courageous opposition to those policies. I hope future generations will be able to appreciate their courage and wisdom. I hope, too, that you will join with them in their patriotic efforts.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD I. CAMMER.

ONTARIO, OREG., July 29, 1965.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for the speech you made in the Senate opposing the President's stand in Indochina. I believe it is the best speech you ever made. Some times I think some Members of Congress have the backbone of a jelly fish.

How can we win a war against 700 million people?

I have been in nine different States and I find very few people in favor of a war with any part of China.

And many many people, workers and young men praised your stand "talk first". Some favored get out.

I was born of white parents in Kansas on a farm, taught school, farm work, vet in World War I, lived and worked 28 years here in eastern Oregon. Was a watchman at Nyssa, Oreg., factory for about 14 years, now I am retired. 72 years old this December. Widowed, live all alone and have a small place north of Nyssa, worth about \$5,000, and will keep it for a summer home.

I pay taxes on it. I am not in favor of vets paying no taxes.

I bought a house in Osborne, Kans., my old home town and plan to spend winters there. Year ago you worked and boosted for social security, insurance companies said it would ruin them, you said it would make them grow and you were right, without it we would be in a mess 50 years behind what we are today.

Now Senator there is another thing I wish you would do for this United States of America.

Get the U.S. Supreme Court to make a decision against State laws that compel our people to buy insurance or put up bond to travel on our public roads. Article I, section 8 says Congress is to establish post offices and post roads, but I do not find any place in our Constitution where it compels or allows States to have laws that force us to buy insurance.

I pay over \$100 a year for car insurance and I need that money to live on.

The premiums are used for members of the insurance companies. It is not used for road maintenance or construction of new public roads.

Drivers licenses money is used for help in Oregon paperwork and when a person is convicted of an offense he loses his license for a time. Drivers license is OK, I believe. A court decision would give each a choice in buying insurance or not to buy and I believe it would do like you said social security would do, make the insurance companies grow.

I sure wish the U.S. Supreme Court would make a decision like I am asking for.

Please write me.

LEE C. TAYLOR.

OSBORNE, KANS.

JULY 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: What in God's name do our military and civilian "experts" hope to accomplish with the insane policy of escalation?

Please inform the President and his "expert" advisers that my wife and I do not sanction interference by the U.S. military in domestic problems of any country; problems which the military mind does not comprehend, or appreciate.

We suggest the flyboys practice using their "toy" guns and hideous napalm to bomb in areas in which innocent women, men, and children are not to be found.

We further suggest civilian authorities to place restrictions on military policymakers. We need no Caesars, Napoleons, or Ludendorffs today. Let the eager military heroes attack poverty here and overseas, illiteracy in and out of the military, and other ills of mankind instead of helpless human beings.

Sincerely,

PETER J. DONAHUE.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for the stand you have taken over the Vietnamese situation. Although, your advice has not been heeded by the decision makers, it has not gone unnoticed by your constituents. Thank you.

Today, Mr. Johnson gave us a sugar-coated pill in his message about Vietnam. He minimized the situation by indicating that he did not think it necessary to call up the reserves, while at the same time he indicated that he would reinforce the Vietnam troop commitment by 50,000 from a now undermanned Army. He also indicated that he would double the draft. Young men need mature leadership or they quickly die on the battlefield. I have a son who will be one of those to go with the 1966 draft or he will volunteer, but I do not desire to see him led by inexperienced garrison soldiers, or dis-

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18427

turbed and disgruntled reservists. I think that he is entitled to receive his training from tried and proven professionals. One good source would be the hundreds of thousands of retired professionals who have left the army after only 20 years service.

Mr. Johnson cannot call up the retired soldiers without congressional permission; however, many are serving in dual capacity as reservists in the retired reserve—many of these men in their late thirties and early forties could well free an active army professional from stateside or service type or training type duties if ordered back to active service. I do not advocate that they be called to duty involuntarily, but they all should be asked to volunteer their services; many with complete dedication would leave lucrative civilian jobs to return to harness. Each one so returned to duty would lessen the need to draft a boy or dislodge an untrained reservist who really doesn't want to go, or can't afford to go. These men could replace the military staff at universities, recruiting service, station complements, and other housekeeping jobs; thereby, freeing well qualified professionals for duty overseas. However, as evidenced during the Korean war—the administration would not do this unless it were dictated by the Congress. It costs less to recall a retiree because he gives up his retirement pay—an economic factor, plus the efficiency that would be gained by the use of experience that is available. Furthermore, many retirees would be qualified for troop duties also. Of course, only physically qualified retirees should be called.

I would appreciate your comments on the above, and ask that you consider these thoughts for possible action as my representative in the U.S. Senate if the president should call for authority to raise more troops.

Sincerely,

RAY A. ZIEGLER.

AMBLER, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR (meant to be an appeal to Congress also): Have you thought of getting impeachment proceedings started against President Johnson, or interesting any of your colleagues in the legalities of starting impeachment proceedings against a President who violates the Constitution by waging undeclared war according to his own will and whimsey?

Surely he cannot play havoc with the lives of U.S. citizens whom he has sworn to serve and protect.

Surely he cannot order boys to their death without Congress lifting a finger.

How has this egomaniac, power-hungry man obtained such absolute authority over this democratic Nation?

Where are the checks and balances of the system?

Can President Johnson (one man) involve the whole world in a nuclear holocaust?

Can he ignore public and world opinion and fool Congress with his pious and hypocritical mouthings that are written by another man?

Democracy is truly dead, if such a man can, unchecked, continue to embroil us, step by step, into a deeper and deeper conflict. He will sacrifice thousands, yea, millions to save face and pride, rather than admit defeat. He dictates to Congress and then presurizes them into sanctioning his wild, cowboy foreign policy. Congress has become a rubberstamp. For shame.

Are there no men of good will left, sane men of authority who will stand up and stop this stubborn, obstinate man?

The late Edward R. Murrow helped to turn the tide against another seemingly invincible tyrant, the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. Let us hope that enough similar good men will come forth, join with you, and turn the

tide against the Johnson gang before it is too late.

Sincerely,

MRS. FRANCES COX CECCHINI.

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ.,

July 13, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In your letter of July 6 you are probably right in the idea that any attempt to remove Johnson from office would backfire. My suggestion for impeachment, however, stems from an anger which has been growing for 20 years. For quite a while after 1945 our diplomacy toward Russia seemed to me to consist mainly of the truculent stockpiling of atomic bombs. Then came McCarthy and no issue could be discussed anywhere, domestic or foreign, without fear of some kind of reprisal—the kind that would, and did, bring ruin to many individuals. Now Johnson has proved to be quite as trigger happy as it was feared his opponent would be. I am very much disappointed in him.

I have not yet read the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (July 1, 1965; pp. 14915 through 14922) but I shall study it thoroughly.

I want to endorse the last paragraph of your July 6 letter which I will copy here:

"I hope that the opponents of Johnson's policy in Vietnam will not fall apart by adopting what we call splinter tactics in conducting this struggle for peace in Asia."

If there is any way in which I can help the opponents of Johnson's Vietnam policy I will do so.

I appreciate very much the care, the thought, and experience shown in your answer to my letter. You may expect to hear from me again. Meantime, any communication or literature from you concerning the cause of peace will be most welcome.

My wife and I are on vacation with truck and trailer heading for Colorado. I am a retired postal employee. We will return to San Bernardino in September when her school term begins. She is a teacher of the visually handicapped there. I am studying a great deal myself in an attempt to become literate in my old age. Rural Kansas—at least the part I was born in—60 years ago did not encourage education beyond the elementary. Or at least I can say it did not encourage a broad outlook. During the First World War I remember signs on the street corners of Newton: "Speak the American language: If you don't know it, learn it. If you don't like it, get out." And German was no longer studied in the schools. I am sure you can read much between these lines.

The vacation is expensive. We should have waited really until next year. But, now is the time. We are still alive and this beautiful country is still here to be seen. What next year will bring no one can tell.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. TURNER.

P.S.—In spite of everything I have become rather fond of the human race. In it there is surely the potential for universal happiness and well-being. But not if everything is reduced to rubble by nuclear weapons.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Negotiate with National Liberation Front for ceasefire in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM R. CHILTON.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I protest latest escalation in Vietnam. Please escalate negotiation attempts instead.

MARCIA BARABEE.

WINNETKA, ILL.,

August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Encouraged by President's recently expressed willingness to consider withdrawal of troops and inclusion of Vietcong in negotiations.

MARY BOYER.

RYE, N.Y.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have telegraphed President re congressional hearings on the war in Vietnam.

MADOLINE WANG.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge great effort cease fire negotiation for peace in Vietnam.

MRS. KAGER RAY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep negotiating for peace in Vietnam.

SELMA EWISS.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support for your hearing on negotiations to secure peaceful means in solving problem in Vietnam and urge support for Goldbergs' efforts at the U.N.

SARITA DAVIS.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Let the U.N. arbitrate in Vietnam then back a free election. Democracy works for everyone.

JAMES KOPF.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly opposed Vietnam step up would support unconditional negotiations with Vietcong.

MRS. HOWARD GADLIN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your efforts to keep world peace. I believe you are right.

MRS. CATHERINE SEGGIE.

U.S. PEACE CORPS PROJECT, WEST-ERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY,
Kalamazoo, Mich., July 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a few lines (long overdue) congratulating you for your stand against United States policy in Vietnam.

As a long and careful observer of events in Vietnam, I concur completely with your pronouncements. While you may not be popular and must be subjected to all kinds

18428

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

of pressure, you have at least the comfort of being able to look in a mirror at yourself. Please keep up the good work—history will judge you well.

Yours sincerely,

CEDRIC C. CLARK,
Former Peace Corps Volunteer.

NORTH MANCHESTER, IND.

Senator MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: We are grateful to you for speaking out against our country's action in Vietnam. We feel that we are interfering in the reasonable plan which was agreed upon at the Geneva Conference, a plan which we agreed to respect. We feel we have no right to bomb North Vietnam or to support those in South Vietnam who have not received the support of their own people. Our boys are being asked to die and our money spent for unjust foreign policy of the United States. We urge that you continue upholding fair principles and oppose the sending of our forces 8,000 miles from here to no good for anyone.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. DWIGHT H. ASHLEY.

FAIR OAKS, CALIF., July 27, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I am writing to you as a citizen of the United States, deeply concerned with those basic assumptions of our foreign policy that seem to underlie our recent actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, MCGOVERN, GARDENING, and others have pointed out on numerous occasions that an effective foreign policy must be based on present-day realities rather than old myths. The following assumptions seem to me extremely dangerous in an age of thermo-nuclear reality.

Our foreign policy apparently assumes (1) that all Communist governments are dangerous to our security and therefore no new Communist governments should be allowed in the world; (2) that subversion can be equated with armed invasion; (3) that our foreign policy should be unified and inflexible and public debate should be discouraged, and (4) that we can win the cold war and this can be accomplished by military methods.

I will try to discuss each of the above assumptions, hoping that this discussion will help to promote a dialogue on this crucial subject. The first assumption does not correspond to present-day reality. Yugoslavia, Poland, and Rumania, for example, offer no military threat to our security. Inherent in this assumption is the belief in a unified worldwide Communist conspiracy. Tito's independence as well as events such as the China-Russia split should be sufficient to dispell this myth.

The second assumption is an extremely important one. If a few Communists attempt to wield some influence in a government or revolution, are we justified in calling this an act of aggression in order to justify our armed intervention? How can an effective war be carried out against subversion? How can we tell a Communist subversive from a socially concerned patriot? Why do we fear subversion? Has any government that was sensitive to the needs and wishes of its people ever been subverted?

The third assumption openly violates the principles of our constitutional democracy. In a society that is ruled by the peoples' representatives at the consent of the governed, the government must provide the people with accurate information and encourage unlimited discussion in the national legislature and among the public at large. Only then are the people and their representatives able to arrive at wise decisions.

The fourth assumption implies the defeat of communism. In this assumption we imply that we have the only political system worthy of existence in the world and that not more than one political ideology can exist at one time. Why is it that we are not concerned about the existence of dictatorships? Isn't this system of government just as alien to our own as communism? Obviously we must learn to live peaceably and with mutual respect for other systems of government. Our only other alternative is to try to conquer the world in order to make it safe for democracy. In my opinion the latter course of action can lead only to national suicide.

With sincere concern,

DAN W. CLANCY.

REDDING, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to thank you for your opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam and ask you to keep up the fight. The hopes and prayers of millions of parents are with you. Keep up the good work.

We have admired your fearless stand on other matters in the past, but, like most, did not take time to write you.

We, like millions of other parents, are wondering why American boys should fight for a system obviously so corrupt as the South Vietnam Government system is. We are sick and tired of more than a decade of bungling in Vietnam. This country has spent enough money there to have bought every family there a good farm, yet the continuing poverty of the peasantry makes them easy converts to the Vietcong.

The rest of the world is turning against us in this war. We look great, using napalm all over the Vietnam landscape. How many innocent people have been destroyed because of indiscriminate plastering of a jungle by burning gasoline and high explosives? The pictures of our own press runs of Vietcong suspects—suspects mind you—being tortured by South Vietnamese soldiers are enough to turn anyone's stomach.

We are losing the respect of all the world. And, fighting in a hostile environment where technological advantages mean little, we are making ourselves the laughing stock of other nations. We and our South Vietnamese allies together can't put down half-starved guerrilla fighters who think they have an ideal to fight for.

Please read the attached editorial. Our prayers are with you.

Sincerely,

GARTH and LORRAINE SANDERS.

[From the Redding (Calif.) Record-Searchlight, July 29, 1965]

LET'S HOPE UNITED NATIONS WILL MEDIATE IN VIETNAM

The one cheering note in President Johnson's press conference speech yesterday was the renewed appeal to the United Nations to do something about the Vietnam situation.

Unless we can get some acceptable international body to take over and mediate, it appears we're trapped in an increasingly bad mess. For without allies, Asiatic or European, we are engaged in a land war in Asia, and in the eyes of a great part of the world this is rich white men killing poor dark-skinned people.

And it's a war in which there is no real winning. Suppose we somehow whip the Vietcong and occupy and control all of Vietnam, or at least of all South Vietnam, and that neither China nor Russia comes into the fight. This would be "victory," but one in which we'd have to be the occupying con-

queror for a long, long time. An alternative would be to set up another of the long series of dictatorships that have plagued this part of the world.

Of course, having gone as far as we have, it's difficult to back out without losing face and welching on commitments. The commitments should not have been made; they were commitments the American people were assured would not be made; they were made to a "government" lacking the support or consent of the people it seeks to govern.

President Johnson did not make the original commitments, though he has tightened them. But now he's stuck with them, and his political enemies, the very ones who have urged him to hit even harder in Vietnam, already have shown they'll make him suffer either way. If he seeks to end the ghastly mess, he'll be called an appeaser; if the war goes on and gets worse, as it shows every sign of doing, it'll be "Lyndon's war" and he'll face a candidate pledged to "bring our boys home."

This is a predicament from which we seem unable to free ourselves. That's why some help from outside will be more than welcome.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courage in speaking out against our occupation of South Vietnam by military forces.

Our position there seems illegal, immoral, and untenable and completely opposed to our stated national concept of goals and ideals in dealing with our fellow men.

Tacit consent in aiding in torture of Vietnamese peasants, both adults and teenagers and actually children, who are caught between the ambitions of two politically opposed groups of Vietnam is perhaps one of the most barbarous acts committed by this country in many decades.

Ruthlessly aiding in bombing indiscriminately, either because of inexperience of the military commanders or complete disregard of international military code, indicates that we have already taken ourselves out of the boundaries of behavior set by the United Nations. As a Christian nation we are setting and appalling example of being far more ruthless than Communist nations.

It is most unfortunate that the advisers of the President disregard United Nations opinion. Whatever good has been achieved on a national level during the President's tenure of his office will be of little or no importance if we continue our international policy of interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. Rather, we should withdraw all troops from Vietnam at once, leaving only our Embassy personnel and work through the United Nations for fulfillment of the Geneva conference to permit the Vietnamese electorate to decide their own destiny. Hopefully they would be willing to become a neutralized nation and put an end to the military dictatorship which we are supporting in South Vietnam.

Again my gratitude that we have one strong, intelligent, and moral voice which speaks out again and again for world law and order.

With warmest best wishes.

Cordially,

Mrs. FRED Z. HETZEL.

SAN FRANCISCO.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: My congratulations on your forthright militant rejection of President Johnson's "war" program.

There are many of us walking in peace marches, talking to friends and coworkers, urging withdrawal and negotiation who are becoming more frustrated and discouraged as each day more dreadful acts are carried

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18429

out in the name of the people of the United States.

Your voice gives us courage to carry on.
Don't fall us—speak out, often.

Most sincerely,

ELLEN IZARD.

JULY 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate your having the courage to speak out and give your opinion on this terrible war in Vietnam. I agree with you completely. I do hope, through your efforts, this civil war in Vietnam can be settled in the United Nations.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. IRENE MANDELL.

JULY 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are fighting a losing battle—but thank God you are fighting.

It seems as though the war hawks including Johnson have gone completely off their mind.

I wish I knew how I could help—I write Johnson almost daily hoping that enough mail against war will make him realize that his words of peace and his actions of war is not fooling anyone.

He would make a good actor—he is always posing—and frankly we turn off our TV when he is on—because he seems to think he is fooling the American people. All he is doing is showing that he is a war hawk—he lied to get the Presidency—so where do we go from here?

Again thank God that you and a very few of the others are protesting—it gives us just a little hope.

Please help us to help you in some show of faith we have in you to possibly make the war hawks come to their senses.

Thank you.

PEGGY KLEMPNER.

YUCAIPA, CALIF.

WOODACRE, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue in your efforts against more military aid to Vietnam and in your criticism of Johnson's policy regarding this disgusting situation.

Thank you.

EVELYN HALL.

CARMICHAEL, CALIF.,

JULY 28, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in the Senate to bring about peace in the world. I feel, as I know you do, that our only hope in this age is the settlement of our problems through world law and the United Nations. I am certain that more and more voices will join yours in this effort in the weeks to come.

Americans everywhere are indebted to you.

Sincerely,

JAMES K. TODD.

P.S.—Since I am a displaced Oregonian now living in California, may I be added to your mailing list.

J. T.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF

NEW YORK AT BUFFALO,

JULY 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Of all the U.S. Senators you must surely stand most erect for your forthright declarations in opposition to President Johnson's war in Vietnam. I can only say that you deserve the highest praise, our foremost respect, and our fullest support in your sustaining efforts to inform the Senate, the President, and the American people of our persistent errors in regard to our military intervention in Vietnam. I

pled with you to maintain your courage and your dedication—not to yield and lose heart.

Let me inform you that our own endeavors to educate the American public concerning the Vietnam situation continue with increasing vigor and dedication through the sponsoring of public debates, speeches, distributions of literature, conversation, and letters to newspaper editors and public officials. If you should have any suggestion to propose to us so that we might be more effective, please do not hesitate to so inform me.

I am wondering if you have available copies of speeches, official publications, or any other written material to send me. I would be most pleased for you to place my name on your mailing list in order to receive whatever you have to offer along these lines.

In closing, let me offer to you a more complete quotation of President Johnson's appeal to reason so often quoted:

"Come now, and let us reason together.

If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land:

But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword.

—Holy Bible, Book of the Prophet Isaiah, chapter 1, verses 18, 19, and 20.

What could be more prophetic?

Respectfully yours,

SIDNEY M. WILLHELM,
Assistant Professor.

WOODLAND HILLS, CALIF.,
JULY 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is the purpose of this letter to register my approval of your stand concerning U.S. policy in southeast Asia, particularly as regards our action in Vietnam.

I greatly admire your courage in taking a forthright stand for what you believe to be right.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. SULLIVAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
JULY 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your comment on CBS regarding Vietnam where you suggest that our dear President send a resolution to the Security Council of the United Nations in order to work out a peace through world law.

He is asking for help through the United Nations but in turn is committing more American forces because the South Vietnamese have given up. This is not a war for freedom. This is an American war. It looks like we are in it to stay.

How can we alert our Congress and the people to the facts. I heard Sander Vanocur—NBC newsman just back from Vietnam explaining this type of war can never be won. If the Americans want to do it alone it will take 2 million men.

Wish you health in order to keep up the courage. Your Governor Mark Hatfield's position is great. I wrote and commended him too.

Sincerely yours,

IDA MESSINGER.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.,
JULY 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I believe you will appreciate the sentiments I have enclosed with this letter. I don't know if you ever looked up any of the Bible passages I have referred to in my material to you. I will say this, you have been unwavering in your fight for honesty

and fairplay in our foreign affairs. If you and your associates could all get busy and recognize the basic soundness of my analysis, perhaps civilization might be saved.

I can anticipate a major American naval disaster in the immediate future. Following that there will be four or five atomic or nuclear bombs dropped by our side in a continuation of "measured" retaliation.

Sincerely,

ELTON R. MAAS.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
JULY 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My own Senators are of no use to me in this matter about which I and many, many of my neighbors feel strongly.

I speak of our activities in Vietnam. It seemed to us that Lyndon Johnson had the opportunity of all history to proclaim peace for the world when he came into office. He did not.

We look at the wars of history and find that after killing numberless men, the peace table was the final settlement. We act like beasts.

What concerns us, out West here, is the real motivation for this war in east Asia. If "communism" the favorite cuss word of our time, is the real cause, then it is the fears of business, private profits and monopolies which are the actual urgency. Is it such things as tin, rice, and rubber and their future control by our "free enterprisers" which are furthering this killing spree, this drafting of more and more young men to snatch their profits for them at the cost of lives, defeated family life, and embittered young men?

I remember, during the Korean war, we had a pet shop and many soldiers on furlough used to come in to play with the puppies and kittens. One day I asked one of these young men what we were accomplishing in Korea. I have never forgotten the way he stiffened up and replied "Not a damn thing."

After that I made a business of asking. Perhaps it was my friendly, gray-haired old lady appearance which made them speak frankly, but out of the 39 I asked they all made practically the same reply.

Why, for instance, have we not sent vessel after vessel loaded with food and materials for bettering life in Vietnam, to get the same result over communism—if it really is communism we fear. Think of the attitude toward America to be created by such gifts, instead of winning what we now have—the disapproval of practically all nations, lost trade with the immense Chinese population, and not the least, the fears, sadness and unwillingness of the parents of drafted soldiers.

Please set me straight. We need the advice and wisdom of a Senator who dares to oppose our Government policy.

Sincerely yours,

ETHEL M. HARTWICH.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
JULY 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I'm with you.

Your truly,

J. E. KATZENBERGER.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
JULY 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You seem to be one of the very few leaders in this country to whom the American citizen can appeal.

18430

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

Why do our statesmen hide their heads in the muck and become merely politicians under the heel of President Johnson? Why is everyone who disagrees with Johnson tarred as a Communist? Is it so that none will dare speak out?

Will we have to whine like the German people did of Hitler's war: "We were not responsible; it was not of our doing."

Khrushchev got out of Cuba. Was he a more responsible leader than Johnson? Doesn't he know or care that the use of violence to solve problems is an absurdity? Or is he some sort of antihero, above the conscience of God and man?

Our late President Kennedy was more than a man for America, he was a man for the world. Will there be anyone to seize the banner from his stilled hand or are we never to have the loathsome yoke of war lifted? Must we all follow like lemmings down into the hellish pit which Johnson is digging deeper for us everyday?

Johnson's arguments for war are as straw in the wind. Everyone of us knows that this country is strong enough to turn back any aggressor. Let not America be the aggressor.

Why hasn't this vital issue been laid squarely before the United Nations where it belongs, in this world that is being forced to use comonsense? Why is Johnson hedging this question?

Surely, America could do more for the peoples of Asia and Africa through a demonstration of allout help in a South Vietnam that is separated from her Communist neighbor, North Vietnam.

This senseless killing of both Americans and Asians is creating vast fear of the U.S. Government throughout the world and in American citizens, also.

In God we trust.

E. COOTS.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter just sent to President Johnson. It is only one of many recent messages to him.

I hope that you will use his recent statements in such a way that he will receive public support for the diplomatic and political approach, rather than the military escalation which seems almost inevitable.

Unfortunately, there are few men in Congress to whom we can make an effective appeal. We hope that you can convince more of them.

Yours sincerely,

SARAH SHORESMAN.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
July 31, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Not long ago, I wired you that I do not want a wider American war in Asia. I still feel the same way. I, however, applaud in your latest remarks that you are ready to talk with the Vietcong and discuss the four points previously made by Hanoi. I hope that your request to the Security Council will be vigorously pursued and will bear fruit before we become more involved in deadly warfare. I hope that diplomatic, political, social, and economic means, not military, will be used from this point on to bring an end to the death, destruction, and disease in both Vietnams. The increase in draft calls, the request for more military spending and expansion of our forces in Asia, frighten all of us and serve to consolidate opposition to our policies throughout the world.

I shall stand behind you in every diplomatic effort to bring an end to the tragedy of Vietnam.

Yours for a better world,

SARAH SHORESMAN.

GAZA, IOWA,
July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: The situation and deplorable U.S. policy in Vietnam has many in this community deeply worried and concerned.

I understand you are one who is in opposition to the bombing in North Vietnam and the terrific military buildup in South Vietnam. If so I would like to extend my sincere appreciation and wholehearted support.

It seems this situation has gotten way out of hand. Not much but disaster is going to be achieved by all the military aggressiveness and show of force. If all the personnel and money could be turned to constructive efforts and peaceful help and building up of the country's resources rather than the current destructive policies how much better everyone would be.

May you continue to work for peace and a constructive U.S. policy.

Many thanks,

Mrs. RUSSELL.

BILLINGS, MONT.,
July 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've listened with interest to the opinions you have expressed in recent years concerning the Vietnam war. I think that we made a terrible blunder and the proper thing now is to admit that we made a mistake and get out of Vietnam, because after all anyone can make mistakes and we have made them before. We should turn it over to the United Nations and let the United Nations take responsibility and be supported at the very time that it needs our support. This should be done immediately before this war escalates into world war III. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE V. KRONMILLER, M.D.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
July 30, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have not seen your name in our papers since Johnson's talk, but I heard on radio that you yelled "murder" with which I wholly agree.

We keep on trying to influence Johnson to cease-fire, to turn the negotiations over to a United Nations which we would support and make strong enough to settle international disputes.

Could some of these clippings be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Do you like to see the editorials and good columnists from the San Juan Chronicle?

My dear man, how I wish we had you for our President.

Carry on.

HELEN HILDRETH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: May I again, on behalf of both myself and Mrs. Borough, express appreciation and gratitude for your firm stand on behalf of world peace in the present crisis precipitated by the Johnson administration? You and the courageous dissident minority of Senators and Representatives who are standing out against the war hawks may well prove the deciding factor in the prevention of ultimate chaos and

dissolution for civilization. Your responsibility is tremendous.

Your battle is by no means hopeless—the people are being mobilized on behalf of peace. It is undoubtedly true that a decisive majority of the politically conscious citizenry of the United States stands for peace—against the escalation of the Vietnamese war and for the prompt settlement of the issues involved through the United Nations. As for the people as a whole, the majority is torn by doubts and fears and though silent, is by no means convinced that it wants its sons to fight a truly foreign war. There are, of course, the representatives of the Pentagon-industrial complex and their defenders—always the enemies of international law and sanity. But these, though powerfully entrenched, are by no means invincible in the face of national and international opinion. I am eager that you and your courageous colleagues accept this wholly rational premise. Do you? You must not concede that you are fighting a losing battle.

Above all else, it ought to be increasingly apparent that the official Washington presumption that this Nation has a right to lay down the moral law for all humanity is ludicrous and totally unacceptable to the rest of mankind. Let's get off our high horse and try to be cooperative human beings.

Thanks again, Congressman BROWN.

Cordially yours,

REUBEN W. BOROUGH.

CORTARO, ARIZ.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The critical Vietnam situation is a very serious problem. It seems that most people, who are concerned about the Vietnam fight, deal with it only with their emotions, not with their intellect (perhaps their brain has been numbed by the slaughter).

Oh, how the American people do need understanding and integrity when they are confronted with controversial problems.

The average public official and the average American is starving for, at least, one of the qualities in which you are outstanding, that is intellectual and moral courage.

I think the national administration is making some good progress with many of our domestic problems, but the foreign policy seems to be far off the course, especially the massacre action in Vietnam.

I think this Nation has no right to use military power to force other nations to adopt an ultra conservative or reactionary government.

It seems to me that for many years the United States has been giving military or economic support to royalty and other dictators in foreign countries.

It seems to me that this Nation is interfering with the democratic processes in Vietnam.

This Government should exercise more effort to stop the Vietnam fight instead of extending it.

Senator, I think some of your views on foreign policy are much better than some of those being followed.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, I appreciate your active intellectual and moral courage in your concern with our today's problems.

Sincerely yours,

A. B. JACKSON.

P.S. A quotation from a cartoon: "The only thing to do is set up a reactionary, incompetent government, then ask for U.S. support."

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18431

EGG HARBOR, N.J.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How courageous a man you are. Your path must be lonely. I pray for you and your convictions, daily. How some of our leaders throughout the world can gamble with millions and millions of lives is nonunderstandable.

A concerned citizen,

Mrs. CALETTE GALLI.

DORCHESTER, MASS.,
July 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in favor of your fight to have President Johnson clarify our foreign policy. You are a patriot to your country. I am sorry that you are harassed by being unable to have your speeches printed because of your dissent from President Johnson's view.

GERALD J. O'ROURKE, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your efforts to have the Vietnam war settled by the U.N. My husband and I are among those who do not approve of U.S. behavior in that country and who do not go along with President Johnson in this area.

Sincerely,

IVY NEVALA.

DAVIS, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My profound admiration for your courageous stand on Vietnam.

You will yet be honored for your expert analysis of this senseless war—if there is anyone left to honor you.

JOHN E. DRAPER.

WEST BRANCH, IOWA,
July 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your "No" vote on May 4, 1965, when the President asked Congress to appropriate an "additional \$700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam" is applauded. May you continue to be responsible to and for the people of these United States and of this world.

Through Christ.
Love,

FRED L. BARNETT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Sir: You are indeed the greatest man in Washington today. I only wish that you were from New York. My representatives—one a man full of Boston beans who must confess to Cardinal Spellman and the other is forever looking for softer matzoth balls on Broadway.

S. MORASKI.

NEW YORK, N.Y., July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to President Johnson.

This country is rapidly approaching the point of no return. You are one of the few people with the courage and honesty to speak out. We look to you for leadership and guidance.

Sincerely,

JANE K. SKLAR.

NEW YORK, N.Y., July 30, 1965.
President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your remarks concerning your distress at having to send our boys

to be killed in Vietnam were unconvincing. To the ears of a mother they had a false ring.

The war in Vietnam is not worth the cost of a single life, American or Vietnamese. If you are at all sincere, you can agree to the implementation of the 1954 Geneva Accords. Then you will be saved the need for shedding tears for our boys.

Respectfully,

JANE K. SKLAR.

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Modesto, Calif., July 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a college teacher since 1930, except for 4 years' service in World War II, I am behind you 100 percent in your program for Vietnam. I also suggest that McNamara and Rusk should go.

Also, the Bundy boys should go.

What can we Democrats do to help matters?

CHARLES BLACK,

Instructor in Anthropology.

P.S. The administration could use a few anthropologists, but then these are not very popular with either the south or the Army.

SPRINGDALE, CONN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want you to know that I think you are the only Senator in Washington that is sensible. Please continue to speak out for you reflect the views of many Americans.

Thank you.

DOROTHY OSILEA.

YPSILANTI, MICH.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Eastern Michigan University Vietnam Committee urges cease fire and immediate negotiations with National Liberation Front in Vietnam.

J. THEODORE HEFLEY.
JAMES R. WALTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I endorse your stand on Vietnam. We were wrong to go there; are wrong to stay there. Two wrongs do not make a right. "May your tribe increase."

CELIA C. LEWIS.

YPSILANTI, MICH.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to cease bombing Vietnam. Begin negotiations immediately with the National Liberation Front.

JAMES R. and JUDITH C. WALTER.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hurrah and cheers. Heard your short comment anent Vietnam fracas tonight at 10 p.m. over Station KCPX, Channel 4.

It is about time some of you in Congress pulled on President Johnson's [but more so on McNamara's and Rusk's and CIA's] leashes. Who says we [the people] want to fight? If Mr. Johnson and his well-heeled backers want to fight a war let them—with their bodies, their blood, their sons—keep the rest of us out of their perille, childish, stupid, Napoleonic games.

We have many problems here. Why not make this country a closer approximation of heaven and leave the rest of the world to their hell-making. And what will the Vietnamese be freed from—an approximation of poverty to the sureness of destroyed productivity? Since when can the destruction of

land be called a blessing? What kind of friends are those who come into my yard to help me in a fight with my brother and who leave me minus a house, a barn, a crop, everything. That is what we are doing in Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson better take care that he not lose more than his face. The one called God may take a look-see on this earth and decide to sweep it clean of all who encumber it because they are spiritually dead. With God, positions and possessions do not count and leaders who lead their followers to evil-doing are guiltier than the ignorant masses they lead.

May that God inspire you to oppose the real malefactors within this and within all nations on this earth. Congress still has the last say-so on declaration of war. Don't let Johnson, et al., eucher us into that declaration.

God be with you.

FRED F. JURASEK.

PORTLAND, OREG., July 30, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I feel the pulse of heartbreak for our Nation at the decision of President Johnson to send his peace and progress program forward on foreign soil with the blood of our sons, and tears of their loved ones.

As our confidence in our President is shaken, please let us extend our vote of confidence to you for the mighty right you stand for, and thank God you can speak out so we can all hear you.

We voted for a man who promised that no mother's son would fight on foreign soil, and not at home; unless we were attacked. The Oregonian depicted our new President and Vice President in colored pictures and ink as peace and progress.

Now he describes "peace" to us as war strategy to have peace if we have to fight for it. He never talks of initiating measures to bring about a peaceful solution. He only suggests that those who do not have either the ability or the confidence in our Nation to offer a solution that will be inviting enough for us to stop killing them because they are Communists.

President Johnson is right when he claims this idea of carrying the war forward over there is an old idea for that is what MacArthur was fired for.

It was hard to expect anything from Ike except war strategy, but somehow we all had high hope that Kennedy would gradually negotiate trade agreements to bridge a way to greater understanding among nations, because of his great intelligence in influencing the nations of the world to work peacefully toward solutions, and his patience to bring them about, and now we mourn his loss to our Nation anew as we see the result of "impatience."

When you speak it is like a light high on a hill of hope, again a vote of confidence from us to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN MAXWELL.

JACKSON, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I cannot vote for you, but I do respect you. Why, why, why must we continue to kill our lovely young boys?

We have spent millions of dollars for United Nations. What is it for? Can't America produce even one good leader that can prevent war?

We are not all behind President Johnson. Is this another Korea? What is our foreign policy?

We fight communism in Asia, then we have it 90 miles away and even in the United States.

18432

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

I thought only Congress could declare war?
I've lost faith in our "Great White Father."
Respectfully but so very, very sad, I am,
Sincerely,

Mrs. CLAUDIA BABCOKE.

EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY,
July 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: As a voter and citizen in the United States, I want to express my deep and sincere appreciation for your courageous stand upon the question of Vietnam. It is comforting to know that the Senate is not entirely without consciousness that in Vietnam the United States has put forward the most unfortunate foreign policy commitment (with the exception of the inexcusable performance in the Dominican Republic) to date.

The United States should never have been in South Vietnam, to begin with. And neither international law nor commonsense support our continued adventures in that unfortunate country.

The only conceivably sensible and honorable thing for the United States to do now in Vietnam is to ask the U.N. to exercise all its possible power to gain a cease-fire preliminary to serious negotiations for a settlement. And negotiations must include all concerned parties (the Vietcong also) at the conference table.

Once the dangerous, insane escalation of the war, and the mutual use of terror and brutality, have stopped, we may all recover our wits sufficiently to make a settlement at least as good as the 1954 Geneva accord—with the United States a signatory this time, please.

Sincerely yours,

ANN HUBBELL.

P.S.—I am sending a copy of this letter to President Johnson.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a college educated, voting, questioning, responsible citizen, I feel compelled to protest what my country is doing in Vietnam and other parts of the world. I may not approve of what other countries do, but that is irrelevant. This is my country, and the only one in which I have an involvement.

I am offended that we feel we have inherited the divine right to determine what is right for the rest of the world. This has burdened us with policing the whole world, enforcing our policies most cruelly at times and, in short, led us to a kind of insanity which calls every revolution communist and quashes the just struggle for freedom. We have turned our backs on the motivations which, in their turn, caused our own revolution. We are ignoring the realities of the world situation.

I feel like a citizen of prewar Germany who sat and watched while the trains took Jews past to be stripped of the final freedom. There is no "right" or "wrong" in this world politically; but there is a wrong, and we all know it, when people are mangled and murdered by us. Hitler leveled Lidice in the war when it was supposed to hold partisans—and the world called it just one more of his atrocities. I do not want my country to be doing the same; I grew up being taught it could never be so.

And even more practically, can we go on using these methods wherever another country would use communism or socialism or whatever to achieve what we already have. It is none of our business. And we cannot keep it up forever. We must find alternative methods to war to settle human disputes. Instead of relying on defense and armaments experts, please listen more to the many

State Department and university experts who are spending their lives working out ways to achieve peace through honest negotiations, economic cooperation, agreement to allow others to differ with us.

In brief, they, whoever they are, are no more perfect than we. We must accept this and plan for, not an end to strife, ways to settle strife without the horrible means of modern war.

Sincerely yours,

JEAN CLARRIDGE PELLETIERE.

YPSILANTI, MICH.,
August 1, 1965.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I wish to convey to you my opposition to the present policy toward Vietnam.

Although the number of our troops has been increased in that area and the draft doubled, the war is hopeless, it seems to me, from a military standpoint. The French committed a quarter of a million troops to the task of defeating the Vietminh and ultimately had to withdraw even though they continued to hold the major cities.

If the war continues to escalate, both Vietnamese and Americans will be killed in increasing numbers in a brutal, senseless war which can go on for years until it becomes another Korea. And the Korean war finally became so unpopular that General Eisenhower in 1952 promised to go to Korea if elected and secure a cease-fire which he did.

The political implication of a continued war in Vietnam is that we will lose more face than we already have among southeast Asians and probably among undeveloped nations over the world. Moreover, if it is communism with which we are chiefly concerned, more Communists will be produced with each day the war continues.

But the most serious results of the war might well be a nuclear confrontation followed by someone's decision to employ atomic weapons. This danger, it seems to me, is so frightening that no nation is justified in embarking on the sort of military adventurism which now characterizes our Vietnam policy.

I urge you to deescalate the war with a view to reducing the tension and removing American troops from Vietnam as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

J. THEODORE HEFLEY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Keep up your fight against the ever-widening U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

Only Congress can declare war, according to the Constitution. We are in a hot shooting war, but why has Congress failed to exercise its war-making authority, which is expressly mandated in article I, section VIII, subdivision 11 of the Constitution?

I am proud that you keep insisting for Congress to debate this issue. Too many of your colleagues in Congress either are too timid, or too indifferent to this life and death problem.

Maybe now Congress will take up discussion of our southeast Asia troubles since hundreds of thousands of our men are to be sent there, and since it is to cost so much money.

I admire you for standing up almost alone in your dissent of current Presidential policy on southeast Asia. The Congress should be grateful to you for saving the war-making policy for the Congress to perform, as the Constitution states.

Yours very truly,

HELEN D. KARSTADT.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I wish to express my great dismay at your decision once again to escalate the conflict in Vietnam. The refusal of our antagonists there to talk peace cannot be a convincing reason for escalation until we have offered to talk with the people we are actually fighting against.

If that kind of peace negotiation now seems like "backing down," we have nobody to blame but ourselves, since our "commitment" to dictate what kind of government the Vietnamese shall have violates all our basic American values.

The only moral purpose for a foreign military presence in Vietnam would be to insure the freedom of free elections by the Vietnamese themselves, and the only way to do this is to make the military presence international; i.e., under the United Nations.

If we are afraid that South Vietnam would go Communist in a free election, then our best bet is to have the U.N. supervise two free elections, several years apart, so that the Vietnamese have a chance to live under the kind of government they now think they want and then have a chance to change their minds if they want to.

Such a policy would do the greatest honor to our American beliefs in democracy and individual freedom. Until it has been tried we cannot honestly claim that we have no peaceful and honorable alternatives to war in Vietnam.

Respectfully,

ELIZABETH CONVERSE.
Copy to Senator WAYNE MORSE.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is being written to say that I agree entirely with your position in the illegal war we are carrying on in South Vietnam. I have read in the papers at times that you are one of the very few men in Congress who have the courage to get on your feet and disagree with Mr. Johnson in this matter. We have no business in fighting a war in South Vietnam and we never made any promises or commitments to any country to do so. We were to furnish some military advisers to that little country but we were never under any obligation to send thousands of troops there to carry on a war.

If the forces of North Vietnam get control of South Vietnam I do not see whether that makes any difference to us. This whole little country is not worth the life of one American soldier. The situation is getting worse and worse. We are losing men every day and the expense is terrible and we the taxpayers have to pay. This is a matter that the United Nations should have to handle and not the United States should handle alone. We ought to get out of that little country as quickly as we can and slow down instead of enlarging the war. If a vote in this country were taken, I am confident that the great majority would agree with you that we should not and have no right to carry on a war in that country. I want to congratulate you upon your courage in the position you have taken. It seems, however, that practically all the Democrats in Congress go along with whatever Mr. Johnson wants and are afraid to oppose him in anything.

With best wishes, I remain,
Respectfully yours,

J. H. ROSS.

P.S.—Our Florida Senator, GEORGE SMATHERS is doing a poor job—he does everything Mr. Johnson orders to be done. I have so written him. I have been a mem-

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18433

ber of the Jacksonville City Council for several years.

J.H.R.

JULY 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you with the hopes that you will relay my plea to anyone who is in a position to listen. Please, please for every mother, son, wife, and children left behind, can't someone put a stop to this horrible mess before it goes any further? It appears that the U.S. Government has gone completely insane with a few exceptions, of course.

As a private citizen, taxpayer, and voter, I am unable to understand the reasons for the insane mess in Vietnam.

Mr. President has explained and explained but I am still unable to grasp the real reasons Why? Are they being told? Or are we being duped again?

Please do whatever you can to help stop the war and register my protest if it will help.

Yours truly,

MRS. LAUREL TODD.

JULY 30, 1965.

Secretary General U THANT,
United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Since all governments have expressed their desire for peace and the ending of the war in Vietnam, may I suggest that you call for a ceasefire to take effect August 14, the 20th anniversary of the ceasefire in World War II. This should be accompanied by steps toward negotiations.

Very sincerely yours,

PHILIP S. ROWEN.

VISTA, CALIF., July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We are in accord with your policy on Vietnam. How can we help you in your efforts?

Sincerely,

MRS. LEROY THOMAS,
LEROY THOMAS.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF., July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've heard many people in this area express their appreciation for your valiant effort in behalf of the Vietnam people. Accept my thanks for all you are doing to promote justice and sanity in world affairs.

LLOYD M. ALLEN.

DEAR SIR: I am simply a citizen who feels that we are embarked upon a losing so immoral path in Vietnam. Altho I am aware of the many mistakes of U.S. policy of the past in this region and of the many fallacies and flaws of the present policy, I find it difficult to consider alternatives. Most of what I read is either out right opposition, with no actual realization of any dangers of outright surrender, or approval of the present U.S. policy. Intelligent criticism, that is aware at least of the perils of surrender and can consider them and still offer alternatives, is what I seek. If you could send me any literature you might have, copies of past speeches on this topic or the names of some other books so I might read, I would be greatly appreciative.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER NEWMAN.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N.Y.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The President's approach to the United Nations in his statement yesterday indicates that he is at last beginning to feel the force of your persistent argument.

I am deeply grateful to you, and to those few of your colleagues courageous enough to support you. I hope you will find the energy

to persist in your wearing, and in many places unappreciated, effort to bring sense into our foreign policy.

I am sure that if it had not been for you, the President would still be holding tight shut even this one little door to peace.

With assurances of my highest personal consideration, I am, sir,

Yours truly,

EMMETT SWISSHELM.

JULY 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I doubt that President Johnson's consensus is any less evident in Oregon than in my locale in eastern Massachusetts, I wish to congratulate you for your (politically) brave stand on this Nation's policy of abandon in Vietnam. Certainly, you are alienating many of your constituents with your statements. It is absurd that the Senate is proving itself so woefully lacking in its willingness to get informed on the development of U.S. policy in Vietnam that only two in its ranks, yourself and Senator GRUENING, seem to be able to bring reason to bear on the problem. More power to you! Vietnam is obviously too delicate a problem to be coped with intelligently by politicians.

I have recently finished reading Harold Laski's "The Rise of European Liberalism" (1936). Below I have quoted the closing passages from that work for you. In them Laski describes his impression of the failure of the so-called Liberal states of the 19th century to avoid the conflagration of 1914. His analysis, which points out the ironies of universal ideals compromised to parochial self-interest and reason perverted by crusading self-righteousness, seemed to this reader compellingly applicable to the posture of the present U.S. policy-making machine. At least it helps to explain our Government's naive understanding of modern Communism, its reluctance to understand Ho, the Viet Minh, the Vietcong, Vietnamese-Chinese relations, its spurious legitimization of South Vietnam in 1954, its sanctification of that regime by means of the SEATO protocol in September of 1954, and its mounting of a crusade there since 1960. Surely, the men in our Government who have so consciously pursued a power position in Vietnam, a position which can be rationalized only through crude abuses of fact and history, must feel threatened by ideas such as self-determination of peoples, anti-colonialism, distribution of goods according to need, to name but a few.

Whether either blind self-righteousness or cunning greed alone inform the outlooks of our Vietnam policymakers is impossible to determine from my vantage point. More than likely both these traits are playing important roles as our Government enjoys equating the protection of mankind's freedom with our national self-interest. With an unassailable formal justification for our policy such as this, it has become increasingly impossible for the United States to keep its foreign policies geared toward satisfying the hoped-for community of diverse nations and political systems that gave a reprieve to the war-torn world in 1945. In essence, the United States is committing its power to a concept of world order that is already obsolete. The self-interest of the United States is its own business which it must square with the interests of the other nations of the world; the freedom of mankind is the business of a genuine United Nations.

Well, enough of my theorizing. Here are the passages from Laski:

"That they [the classical liberals] had made war and revolution in their search for authority they either did not remember or chose to forget. That there was a time when they, also, had been driven to plead for understanding and justice and mercy they no longer recollected. That the liberty they

cherished was, in sober fact, a freedom denied to the overwhelming majority of their fellow-citizens too rarely entered into their conscious thoughts. They had refused to see that a just society means either one in which there is recognition of an equal claim upon the common stock of welfare, or one, at least, in which differences in reward are capable of justification in terms of relevance to that common stock. They had been content to assume that a profitmaking society will, as science bestows the fruits of its discoveries upon mankind, always be wealthy enough to buy off its adversaries with material concessions. On their assumptions, they could not foresee that the forces of production would come into conflict so profound with the relations of production as to jeopardize the continuity of all the habits by which they shaped their lives. That conflict had been predicted throughout the course of the 19th century; but, for the most part, they had refused to take those steps by which its acerbities might have been assuaged.

"So that when the conflict did come, they were unprepared for its advent. Like their predecessors, they fell into angry panic, and felt with conviction that no price was too high to pay for the retention of their privilege. Even when the price exacted was the destruction of the liberal spirit, they did not hesitate to justify that sacrifice. They called it the common well-being, the maintenance of order, the preservation of civilized life. They refused to admit that the energizing principle of their society was exhausted. They could not believe—even with the evidence dramatically before their eyes—that mankind was ready for a new social order based upon a new relation of man to man. They had in their hands the choice between peace and war. But so completely were they in thrall to the profitmaking motive that, in the name of humanity, they blindly chose war, without the vision to perceive that the thing they called humanity was no other than the greed they served. So, as in the 16th century, mankind seemed to enter upon a long period of winter. We can comfort ourselves only with the hope that a later generation will detect in its rigors the grim prelude to a brighter spring" (pp. 263, 264).

Sincerely,
PAUL A. FIDELER,
Instructor in History, State College,
Framingham, Mass.

RIVERSIDE, RIPARIUS, N.Y.,

July 30, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have a new wrinkle of an argument for you in your continuing and just fight against the administration's immoral policies in Vietnam, though perhaps it occurred to you.

We are allegedly fighting to preserve and secure freedom for the South Vietnamese and we are using B-52's and napalm in this cause. Do we love freedom so much that we would send some marines to South Africa to release the hundreds of political prisoners there—who are imprisoned because they have stood up for certain minimal human rights? Or is our concern for freedom highly selective and relevant only where our banks do not have significant investments. In short, our guardianship of freedom is strangely selective and seems limited to destroying the terrain of primitive countries to stop communism. How about freeing Albert Luthuli?

Cordially,

WARREN E. STEINKRAUS.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,

July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing a copy of a letter mailed to Senators JAVITS and

18434

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

KENNEDY, and Congressman ROSENTHAL. We wish to express our approval to you and Senator GRUENING for being two courageous men whose views we applaud.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL J. HOLLAND,
BURT S. HOLLAND.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
July 30, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: We are tremendously concerned regarding the escalation of our administration's war in Vietnam. It is a war not declared by the Congress or approved by the American people. We believe that neither we Americans nor the Western World is being threatened in the manner that the Nazis menaced all mankind.

We further believe that the Vietnamese have the right to determine their own destiny and their own form of government. All countries cannot be shaped in our image. If President Johnson wants free elections, let him adhere to the principles agreed to at the Geneva convention.

We urge you to prevail upon our Government to act with sincerity and to talk with the majority of the Vietnamese who have been fighting for more than 40 years to free their country from aggression. The so-called Vietcong are resisting us and it should be to these people who are fighting that we must address with our proposals of peace, if they be real.

That the German people did not speak out and protest a Hitler is now piously lamented. We who still have the right of dissent must speak up now against the unilateral policy decisions which are earning us the enmity of the free as well as the uncommitted countries of the world. Our staunchest allies can hardly contain their criticism of our actions.

Since our country has not been provoked our attitude is insane. If this madness continues much longer our country will cease being a democracy despite the administration's brilliant record domestically.

Where are the leaders who will speak up for us? If no one appears soon enough, words such as these will soon be deemed traitorous and treasonable.

May heaven help us.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL J. HOLLAND,
BURT S. HOLLAND.

LINCOLN CENTER, MASS.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do not need to explain to you why I believe our present course of action in Vietnam is wrong—if not insane. But I can see no hope of reversing it except through the action of the U.S. Senate.

The people will follow the President blindly, more readily because of his evident, sincere desire for peace "with honor." The conditioned reflex of the cry of "stop communism" is strong. But I see little hope of a solution along lines acceptable to the President's advisors through the United Nations—whom the Vietcong is unlikely to trust.

I believe we must get out with what little dignity remains possible and save our powder for a better fight—which please God may not be necessary—such as a Chinese invasion of India. This present one can lead to nothing but an interminable, massive military occupation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. PRESTON.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you and thank you for your courageous

stand against U.S. military policy in Vietnam. This policy (like a cancer) has eaten into the hearts and minds and morale of our American people to the extent that they are no longer able to honestly evaluate our actions. I believe the Pentagon must be responsible for this. This damage to ourselves could become irreparable if not checked. My heart aches for the people of Vietnam.

What can be done to turn the tide of our military policy? The American people do need and want peace. With all best wishes for your continued strength and good health to work for peace.

Sincerely,

ALTA B. CHUSID.

OTTAWA, KANS.,
July 30, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to say I approve of your views on the world situation in which you state you believe the United States must take the initiative for peace. The President has lagged here, or doesn't believe it.

I am opposed to the present Government war policy as I understand it. I urge you to work for cessation of U.S. bombing raids on North Vietnam; cessation of troop movements to South Vietnam.

I urge you to continue to work for peace, especially to make full use of the U.N. resources. I feel the latter has not been done.

Yours sincerely,

RUTH A. HANNA.

EAST CHICAGO, IND.,
July 28, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to compliment you on your stand on the Vietnam crisis. It's too bad that we don't have more in the Senate today with your understanding.

I am a lifelong Democrat as my voting in East Chicago will verify. I was one of those who welcomed our President to East Chicago during the time he ran for President.

I am very disappointed in his stand on the Vietnam policy. I feel strongly that we have no obligation there and especially in the needless sacrifice of our American youth.

Recently I returned from a 4,000-mile vacation trip. Rather by accident in my travel which covered 11 States, the Vietnam situation was mentioned and discussed. Sometimes it was a gas station attendant and others such as fishermen, resort owners, restaurant operators, etc. Most of those I talked with disclosed their politics, and were Democrats, and all of them condemned the President and his policy on Vietnam. In Washington, D.C., I heard the same comments.

The States through which my travels took me were Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Washington, D.C., Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

I estimate that I talked with 40 to 45 persons. Remember these are the working class of people and not executives, and so forth. Also, I determined that by far the largest majority were Democrats and were very bitter.

As a businessman I am hearing the same thing from customers every day and this is a very strong Democratic vicinity.

Again congratulations and keep up the good work. You are winning a lot of respect.

Yours truly,

HERBERT O. JOHNSON.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is an expression of support for your outspoken

criticism of the Johnson administration's present foreign policies. I am disgusted by the acquiescence of Congress in the face of this grave situation. A full scale debate of the Vietnam war by the Senate is definitely in order. I strongly urge you to continue your efforts to present rational alternatives to our present foreign policies. You have the support of a large proportion of the bay area citizenry. Could you send me a couple of your most recent speeches concerning the Vietnam situation?

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. SAYRE.

SENATOR MORSE: Keep up your Vietnam criticism. You are correct.

Truman made a mess in Korea, Johnson has made a mess in Vietnam.

You may not agree with some of the things I say. But look at things correctly and you will see.

ABN.

MONCKS CORNER, S.C.,
July 29, 1965.

Gov. MARK HATFIELD,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATFIELD: With interest and satisfaction I noticed that out of all the various Governors assembled, only you and Governor Romney had sense and courage enough to voice opposition to sanctimonious talking Lyndon-come-lately as related particularly to the ever-growing-worse situation in Vietnam.

My hat is off to both of you gentlemen—and my sincere wish is that other men, both in Governor's seats and in the U.S. Congress will awaken what is going on and side with you two gentlemen.

A fair, sensible and impartial look at U.S. involvement in Vietnam should make every intelligent man and woman realize that from the very beginning conditions pertaining to U.S. involvement have steadily gone from bad to worse. And, of late, alarmingly so.

Henry Cabot Lodge, whom I long ago dubbed, "Mr. Saigon failure," accomplished little or nothing during his reign in Vietnam. Now he is back. And why? More because of politics than ability.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor has nothing to boast about for his efforts.

Arrogant McNamara made several trips to Vietnam. And if he accomplished anything worthwhile—except wasting public money on such trips—it has not been apparent.

It seems to me, as I think it should be to anyone and everyone with good sense, that the fault lies with the political leadership in Washington.

The Vietcong have, on occasions too numerous to mention, made monkeys out of the men sent to Vietnam by the Washington chapter of the political KKK.

Just to mention three: When that building was bombed killing several sleeping Americans, the official excuse was in the jungle and couldn't be guarded. Bah. Green, country boys with buckshot could have and would have protected that building as it should have been. Apparently, no leader.

When those several planes were destroyed. Officially, accidental.

Bah again. No competent leadership was evidently there.

When correctly timed and planted bombs at that floating restaurant. These three occurrences should make people wonder why this Government did not hire a few Vietcong leaders to guide American destinies in Vietnam.

Now, the United States under the guidance of the Washington leaders of the political KKK who have made a mess so far in Vietnam, is flirting with a real war.

If we are to become engaged in a real war, why, oh why can't the sensible and thinking people of America work for and find

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18435

a way to make the nigger vote wooing political racketeers in Washington take a back seat, and in their place, put real men to guide this Nation when real leadership is most wanted? Men of the caliber of Gen. Mark Clark.

The only war that sanctimonious talking Lyndon-come-lately: Smiling, smirking HUBERT, arrogant McNamara, bullying Katzenbach, and their tools among the Federal judiciary who have made a mockery of city and State laws, can win—have the ability to win—is the war against the hated and persecuted South to force equality between races that God did not make equal.

Withholding Federal funds, Federal patronage from Members of Congress who dare to buck the political KKK, numerous forms of reprisals, Federal court edicts that have made crimes committed by beastial niggers skyrocket, and all such practices of the political KKK will never win a war in Asia or Russia.

This Nation needs real men at the helm to guide our destiny—not the poor excuse for men with the welfare of their Nation and all of its people at heart, that we now suffer from.

Think over what I have told you. We sorely need real leadership—far different from what we now have: a leadership that will work for the welfare of this Nation and all its people. Instead of working to win the votes of a class that can and will be led to the polls as so many sheep.

A. B. NIMITZ.

LOWELL, MASS.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I commend you for your forthright statement on Vietnam.

It is heartening to many of us who feel that we are being catapulted into a untenable situation to know that there remain some public figures who have the courage to represent reasonableness at a time when this may not be popular.

After reading your comments, I was moved to send the enclosed letter to my Senators and Congressmen.

Very truly yours,

CAROL GASS.

Copy enclosed.

LOWELL, MASS.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator KENNEDY,
Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: My deep concern over the recent stepped-up involvement on our part in the war in Vietnam has forced me, an unaccustomed public letter writer, to write to you. Like many, I have sat by silently awaiting the forces of wisdom and restraint to eventually assert themselves in our foreign policy. I am now, however, appalled and frightened by the accelerated tempo of our determination to risk total war as the price of what must appear to much of the world as our determination to throw our weight around.

Phrases such as "survival of the free world," and "protection of Asia," have a hollow sound as we find no active allies among the free world or the Asians. Indeed, although our President has clarified what we must fight against, there appears little indication of any stable entity or philosophy in South Vietnam that we are fighting for. I appreciate that the situation cannot be oversimplified and that we are in a difficult bind in terms of commitments. Yet there must be a cheaper price for saving face than further

immersion in this tragic venture which can obviously not be solved through further loss of human lives.

Was it not our fear that just this very kind of situation could trigger off another world war that made us so determined to set up a Council of Nations? Why have we not transferred the responsibility of seeking some compromise solution for this problem to this world body where the United States can take its proper, supportive role along with the other freedom loving people of the world? I do not idealize the power of the U.N., yet feel that it can only begin to gain stature and become a meaningful instrument as we entrust it with the problems of the world and invest in it our integrity and strength.

Very truly yours,

CAROL GASS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 30, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Abraham Lincoln has been credited with the statement that "Some of the people can be fooled some of the time but not all people can be fooled all the time." It came to mind Wednesday morning when suffering the agony of watching you on my television screen announcing the sending of countless thousands of young Americans as cannon fodder to the slaughterhouse in Vietnam.

Embarking upon an undeclared war no different from the criminal actions of Germany and Japan when starting World War II without the sanction of Congress, in arrogant contempt of and in flagrant violation of the Nation's Constitution. Apart from the nauseating grin on your countenance, the hypocritical use of the words "peace" and "freedom" it was sickening to hear your sanctimonious protestations of your concern for the young people you are dispatching to most cruel, premeditated mass murder and misery.

Like warring heads of state in times past you have also invoked the support and blessings of Providence. It was the immortal Scotch poet Bobby Burns who once exclaimed "God does not give nor accept pleas and thanks for murder." This on the occasion of an invitation to participate in a church Thanksgiving ceremony after one of Britain's many imperialist, colonial adventures. If there exists a just Providence what severe punishment must await you and your kind when summoned to appear on judgment day. See Michelangelo's masterwork in the Sistine Chapel in Rome, "The Last Judgment."

The German people by silence and acquiescence allowed Hitler to come to power. Our planet has still not recovered from that tragedy. Your acts of aggression in Vietnam if not stopped can only lead to world war III, for which history will denounce and condemn you.

I, a civilized human nearing the three-fourths century mark, will not remain silent. For the sake of our planet's preservation and in order that America's youth and families may live out their lives in peace, uninterrupted by the scourge of war, I demand that you cease and desist your acts of aggression.

Yours truly,

HERMAN STUYVELAAR.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your voice sounds like that of the only sound man in an insane asylum. I wish something could be done that it may be heard all over the world turning this escalating nightmare into a bad dream—and

the dawn of commonsense and peace into reality.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KENDE.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N.Y.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although you are not of my home State, New York, nevertheless the views you are holding forth are my views and from what I've read in the newspaper, may I express my wholehearted admiration for your remarkable courage in your outspoken criticism of the President's Vietnamese policy and of the brutal sending of our American boys to sacrifice their lives in such a coldblooded manner. I'm shocked and may I say that you earn my most profound respect and may God bless you for having a conscience and not having the timidity to speak out against the sickening war this administration is carrying on without any regard for our youth and fighting men. I also have a son just turned 18 who is very depressed and most unhappy over the state of affairs now going on in our country. Our Congress is being ignored for a formal declaration of war. We might as well have no Constitution for all the administration cares. The U.N. is a peacekeeping organization. Where are they functioning, on paper only? Also I see by the newspapers that your most worthy Governor, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, was the only Governor besides Governor Romney of Michigan who had any spunk to disagree with the other Governors. It really seems to me, as a resident of New York City, that the only intelligent members of our Government, who have minds of their own, are not afraid to express their own individual opinions are the rugged individualists from the State of Oregon, such as yourself, sir, your Governor and also a Senator from Alaska.

Senator MORSE, although I'm only a woman, and a poor one at that, were I given the opportunity, I would have liked to get up on the floor of Congress and express my anguish and sorrow as a mother, and also express the pain of the countless millions of mothers of our land, the poor people whose lives have always been one of hardship and poverty, and to have the final insult thrust at them by having their flesh and blood sent to be killed or maimed in a far-off jungle and for what, I ask you. God bless you again, and I feel grateful at least that the mothers have at least one champion in you to defend us in the Halls of Congress.

May God give you strength to fight those policies of the administration in Vietnam and to let yourself be heard.

Sincerely,

MRS. MILDRED TIRADO.

SAN GABRIEL, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I congratulate you highly for your strong opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam. You are truly a prophet crying in the wilderness. I only wish many would heed your words. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

ROLLAND THOMPSON.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Urged end to hostilities and negotiations in Vietnam based on Geneva accords.
Dr. and Mrs. R. S. FREEMAN.

18436

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 2, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:Do not relax anti-Vietnam war effort.
Strongly support you. Doing everything we
can.

DOROTHY ALLEN.

JULY 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SEN: This is inquiry based upon
fading hope and mounting awe.

I am shocked by the Vietnam policy of the United States. I have communicated this shock to Senator KUCHEL, and, to the President of the United States. I have not received a reply, despite my letters conveying an interest in understanding their perceptions. But, I need a reply, if only to frustrate the growing tension within me which manifests itself by contaminating somewhat the doctrine of peace and democracy which purportedly motivates our Nation. Thus, I am writing you, in the anticipation that your publically announced position on Vietnam will allow you the political freedom to react to my often compromising questions.

I inquired of the Senator and of the President: by what right does the United States impose its might upon a primitive country that has for centuries resisted external control? By what authority does the United States exercise its weaponry upon innocent South Vietnamese women and children? Under what aegis does the United States preempt the United Nations in the search for peace, or, if not peace, then negotiation? What are our naive assumptions regarding the ephemeral nature of the South Vietnamese political puzzle? What ideological ignorance is the matrix for the apparent presumption that the Vietnam population possess the awareness of higher authority, national identity, or personal integrity sufficient to form the conviction demanded for victory, or even combat? What evidence is there which suggests the commitment of the lay South Vietnamese individual, who, ultimately, will be expected to power the social aspect of reconstruction? What is the protracted design regarding southeast Asia? Is Vietnam a bogus issue, and is Red China the ultimate foe? What is the reason for the apparent disparity between the combat troop reports (on deficiencies of weapons, material, etc.) and the Pentagon reports? How do you account for the likely bamboozling of the public by the administration, which manifests itself in weekly estimate contradictions, reversing position evaluations, heavy press censure, etc? How can one American death be justified in a war that isn't a war, fought by native soldiers who aren't soldiers, for a government that isn't a government? Is the stability of the mightiest Nation in the history of man dependent on aggression? And lastly, what happened to Goliath?

I wonder how representative our Government really is. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN STELLERN.

GREELEY, COLO.

LYNDONVILLE, VT., July 26, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Can anything be done to stop this senseless war in Asia?

We will not have a friend in the world.

Sincerely,

W. ARTHUR SIMPSON.

CASA GRANDE, ARIZ., July 22, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading ancient history. I wonder where we have so

utterly failed. History repeats itself and no nation has remained free more than 200 years. Wouldn't you think people would learn. Is it true that luxury living only breeds rabble and it takes 200 years for that rabble to get strong enough to rule things. Elections in our loved land is now only a farce. Under a really free election the people who have gotten elected for the last 35 years would never have made it. These people fear the truth worse than the Devil hates holy water. What good is education if it does not teach godliness, patriotism, honor, duty, cleanliness of mind and body, and most of all love to work, not play.

We know that for many years there has been an evil force working to destroy everything that makes life worth living. They talk of progress—the only progress they are making is back not forward. And as sad as it is this has all been planned from the start of our loved land. The Constitution, the envy of the world, is no longer a shield but a weapon. All this did not just happen, but was planned.

Now anyone with the courage to stand against them gets the smear act. They dare not start an argument by attacking what they say, for they only tell the truth—and the truth must not be known, at any price.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of truths, but are being ignored. Let me suggest you read up on your history and see if you want the same kind of government that men have struggled for years to free themselves from. Or is the people under 45 unable to be anything but slaves.

Thank you.

MRS. J. D. KIRKPATRICK.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., July 31, 1965.LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing in sorrow and outrage that our country has proceeded with an extremely serious escalation of the Vietnam war, masked by appeals for peace. Many who voted for you, like myself, voted for opposition to Senator Goldwater's call for war. We will not be deceived by words which are denied by actions.

Others who are now swayed by admiration of your domestic program and the authority of your office will be shocked to reality as the costs of our country's intervention mount. If vigorous protests were made to Democratic Senators and Congressmen when an immediate call of the Reserves was expected, what will happen when the costs of a war which has increasingly ominous prospects hits vast numbers of our people? Reality will not forever be masked by word illusions.

Moreover, I urge that you consider the wiser voices of our friends before we suffer new setbacks. As the Manchester Guardian recalled on June 27, we twice removed Souvanna Phouma with unhappy results, and our illusion that if only foreign subversion could be stopped, all would be well is a fatal misconception. As our own press has emphasized, the North Vietnam aid became significant only after our mounting intervention.

Since you quoted the Bible in your Johns Hopkins address, it is appropriate to urge that you consider another part, "As a man sows, so shall he reap."

Even at this late hour, let us turn from words of peace with acts of war to both words and acts of peace. Ask the United Nations to organize negotiations among all parties involved in the Vietnam war. This will include the Vietminh as well as the government of North Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN S. CAMPBELL,

Associate Professor of Chemistry.

P.S.—I am enclosing a copy of this letter in appreciation of your persistent effort for a

peaceful solution of the Vietnamese war. Your work is needed more than ever before.

Copies to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.

JULY 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You must keep yelling against this Vietnam madness. Atrophy must have set in with your colleagues. They cannot be allowed to sit idly by and let Johnson-McNamara & Co. push us over the brink.

WHITTIER, CALIF.

CHEVY CHASE, Md.,
August 1, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have sent to President Johnson on the Vietnam situation. I hope my letter helps in your brave attempt to keep our Government from escalating this war to a point of no return.

Good luck.

MIRIAM LEVIN.

CHEVY CHASE, Md.,
August 1, 1965.President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I speak to you as a mother and want to assure you first of all that I am fully aware of the awesome job you have as our President.

As a mother I also have the job of giving my son confidence that if he is drafted to go to South Vietnam he is doing the right thing for his country to kill and perhaps be killed. In this capacity I would appreciate it very much if you would answer some very troubling questions.

In essence you say that we are fighting in that small country to keep men free so that the ideology of communism will not spread in southeast Asia and then have the opportunity to come to this country.

From all reliable reports I have heard the majority of people in South Vietnam are with or for the Vietcong. If the majority of South Vietnamese people are with the Vietcong and are helping them fight the Saigon Government, my commonsense tells me that the Vietcong must be better to the people than the Government of Saigon which we are keeping in power.

My questions are:

1. If the majority of people in South Vietnam do not want the Saigon Government ruling them, why should we, thousands of miles away, insist, by such methods as we are using, that these people be ruled by a government they are fighting to get rid of?

2. Is it our job to tell these millions of people that they don't know what is good for them?

3. Shall I tell my son that we are killing the Vietcong because we say they are Communists, and Communists are very bad people in our thinking?

4. If such be the case then why don't we send our army to the other Communist countries such as the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, etc., etc., instead of having diplomatic and economic relations with them?

5. I would like to tell my son, Mr. President, what you think a Communist is and just what does communism mean?

It seems to me that our country's approach to the whole Communist problem, (if that's what you say our problem is) is inconsistent and really makes no sense to me at all so that I could not in good consciousness at this point tell my son to go to South Vietnam and in this way help our country.

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18437

I am very serious about these questions and would appreciate some serious answers. With sincere good wishes,

MIRIAM LEVIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enclose a copy of a letter to Mr. Leon Stein, editor of Justice, ILGWU, for your reference.

I regret that I cannot vote for you. For awhile I thought that men like you are no longer around. Although the workers are inarticulate because of the suppression of democracy in the unions, they are with you in this great struggle for morality and the good name of our country. History will prove you right; unfortunately, the Pentagon may swallow millions of lives to provide the proof.

May God be with you all the time.

Very truly yours,

JULIUS BUCHWALD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

Mr. LEON STEIN,
Editor, Justice, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. STEIN: Thank you for your letter of June 21, 1965, concerning my suggestion that you invite Senator MORSE to reply to Dean Rusk's remarks in Justice. In my letter of June 4, 1965, I also indicated that in the spirit of the current discussion of American policy in Vietnam, and in the best interest of our union, it is essential that all pertinent views be heard.

You state, however, that "The two basic, divergent positions in Vietnam were presented fully and effectively by two leading spokesmen—Senators DOBB and CHURCH—in the March 15, 1965, issue of Justice."

I have studied the matter and feel that since the article by Senator CHURCH appeared more than a month before the Rusk excerpts, it cannot be considered an adequate reply to both DOBB and Rusk. Also, Senator CHURCH's position is weak and self-contradictory.

Senator CHURCH asks: "Why have we spread ourselves so thin? What compulsion draws us, ever deeper, into the internal affairs of so many countries in Africa and Asia, having so remote a connection with the vital interests of the United States?"

And he asserts: "Such a vast undertaking has at least two defects: First, it exceeds our national capability; second, among the newly emerging nations, where the specter of Western imperialism is dreaded more than communism, such a policy can be self-defeating. As a seasoned, friendly foreign diplomat recently put it: 'The United States is getting involved in situations where no one—not even a nation of saints—would be welcome.'"

But then he adds: "the judicious use of both the arrows and the olive branch represents our best hope for avoiding a widening war in Asia."

How does this position differ from the administration's? Come, come, Mr. Stein, do you really believe, do you, that Senator CHURCH represents the other basic, divergent position? In effect, Senator CHURCH says bomb North Vietnam "judiciously" and talk about negotiations because "we are losing the contest." Senator CHURCH appears to be somewhat more cautious than the administration.

A report concerning a debate between Senator CHURCH and Republican Representative FORD of Michigan defines Senator CHURCH's position: "A long-time critic of U.S. policies on Vietnam from the liberal side, Mr.

CHURCH was forced by Mr. Ford's arguments into a defense of the administration's strategy. The Idaho Democrat declared that an abrupt step-up of the war by U.S. air attacks would almost certainly bring the North Vietnamese Army to intervene in force. This would mean the very type of land war that Mr. Ford wishes to avoid, Mr. CHURCH argued." (New York Times, July 19, 1965.)

It is obvious that Senator CHURCH merely objects to our spreading ourselves "so thin" and to the "abrupt" step-up of the war, but not to a gradual step-up of the war. I find Senator CHURCH's position very interesting.

I do not understand on what basis you determined that there are two basic positions on Vietnam. May I point out that there are other "basic" opinions. For example:

Walter Lippmann maintains that North Vietnam, Saigon, and the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) should decide the issues for themselves. In the New York Herald Tribune, July 8, 1965, Mr. Lippmann says: "The new policy would have to be, it seems to me, a pullback of our forces from the defense of villages and small towns to one or more highly fortified strongpoints with certain access to the sea, and then to advise Saigon that it should seek to make peace with the Vietcong and with North Vietnam."

And Bertrand Russell has said: "The U.S. Government is conducting a war of annihilation in Vietnam. The sole purpose of the war is to retain a brutal and feudal regime in the south, and to exterminate all those who resist the dictatorship of the south. A further purpose is an invasion of the north, which is in Communist hands."

"The real concern which brings the United States to pursue the brutal policy abandoned by France in Indochina is the protection of economic interests and the prevention of far-reaching social reforms in that part of the world." (Letter to the editor, New York Times, Apr. 9, 1965.)

In the New York Times Magazine section, January 3, 1965, the well-known playwright, Arthur Miller, spoke out against the atrocities committed by the Saigon regime: "Who among us knew enough to be shocked, let alone to protest, at the photographs of the Vietnamese torturing Vietcong prisoners, which our press has published? The Vietnamese are wearing U.S. equipment, are paid by us, and could not torture without us. There is no way around this—the prisoner crying out in agony is our prisoner."

Lewis Mumford, president of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, denounced U.S. political and military policy in Vietnam as a "moral outrage." (The Nation, June 21, 1965.)

On July 16, 1965, on the Senate floor, Senator WAYNE MORSE stated: "I have said for many months that I am satisfied, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate, that we have a dangerous, desperate group of men in the Pentagon who want a preventive war against China and who would like to create an opportunity to bomb the Chinese nuclear installations. I consider them the most desperate and dangerous men in all the world." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 16523 ff.)

Here, Mr. Stein, are five opinions which justice must take note of, if it intends to present "basic, divergent positions" on Vietnam. This may interest you, Mr. Stein: In the editorial section of the New York Times, July 25, 1965, an article by E. W. Kenworthy is captioned, "Johnson's Policy in Vietnam—Four Positions in Congress."

I have suggested that you print Senator MORSE's opinion because he is the foremost American opponent of the Johnson policy and he emphasizes the immorality, the atrocity, the criminality of U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Senator CHURCH complains only

that we are "exceeding our national capability" and that we are "losing this contest." What would he say if we were winning?

Publishing Dean Rusk's statements without an adequate reply places our paper in the category of an organ of the State Department and the Pentagon, in the service of war propaganda. There must be equal space for all pertinent views. This is the American way, Mr. Stein.

In order that Vietnam may be fully discussed, and in order to stimulate discussion on other important national issues and trade problems, I suggest that you establish a "Letter to the editor" department in Justice, and I hereby submit this letter for such a department.

I also wish to take this opportunity to express my indignation at your using our union paper for Mr. George Meany's vulgarity. I am referring to the May 15-June 1 issue of Justice, in which Mr. Meany defines the academic community as "intellectual jitterbugs and nitwits." Should someone offer you such trash for publication in the future, please, Mr. Stein, think before you print.

I look forward to your reply to the issues I have raised.

Yours truly,

JULIUS BUCHWALD,
Cutters' Local No. 10, International
Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OHIO,
July 31, 1965.

Honorable Senator WAYNE F. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While you're not a Senator from Ohio (more's the pity), I have followed your Senate career and feel I can write to you and have a sympathetic ear.

I am unequivocally opposed to the whole Vietnam mess and think the United States, under President Johnson (although I voted for him because I thought he would not get us into a war), is treading a dangerous and horrible path. During my vacation travels (on this continent) I've heard nothing but grave opposition and real concern at the beligerent steps taken by our President. I hope you and many other Senators will have the intestinal fortitude to stand up against this foolhardy increase in men and munitions to Vietnam. You will have my support and that of many, many others if you do. And I am mindful that you and Senator CHURCH were the only ones (that I remember, anyway), who stood out against this in the beginning. I think it is monstrous and disgraceful that our President has so high-handedly bypassed the U.N. If it fails, we are the ones who made the most massive hatchet stroke to bring about its downfall.

It occurs to me that once again the House of Representatives will rubberstamp Johnson's and McNamara's demands for funds to carry this on. Wars never settled any problems and never will. It seems to me that man's inhumanity to many is a greater curse to the world today than communism. I hope you in the Senate will have the courage to speak out and vote against any further increase in money or men for Vietnam. We surely would be the first to protest if they tried to come over and bomb us into settling our racial problems, in the South or North.

Sincerely,

MARTHA L. STEWART.

ARBOR NALL FARM,
Stilwell, Kans., July 29, 1965.

Senator MORSE: Keep fighting for a new foreign policy. War is too important to be left to the generals.

We cannot be policemen for the world.

Respectfully,

IRA STEIN.

18438

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Perhaps if I knew all the facts I wouldn't agree with you. However, from what I've been able to gather, our stand in Vietnam is wrong—not to mention the Dominican Republic.

L.B.J. did not receive a mandate; it was a popular rejection of what Goldwater stood for ("even Lyndon"). It's ironic that the public seems to be getting what, in essence, they voted down at the polls in 1964.

There seems to be an inference that if one doesn't agree with the administration, he is slightly less than patriotic. I say "Hogwash, and hurray for an intelligent opposition." I have never written a letter like this before, but I want you to know that some people think highly of you for your courage to stand on a seemingly unpopular issue.

Respectfully yours,

LAWRENCE Y. YATSU.

JULY 30, 1965.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE: Again I have written to our President to recommend to him your thinking on Vietnam situation. On page 2 of today's New York Times, our President is quoted as being grateful to the women of the land who support his position in Vietnam. Today, I wrote to him explicitly and solely to tell him that many "women of the land" are opposed to his position in Vietnam.

Again I read with interest and hope whatever the press prints on your position in Vietnam. I have also written to my Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS.

Respectfully,

MRS. EDNA LEVINS.

VICTORIA, TEX.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We read your statement on Vietnam. We want you to know most of the people in this area concur with statements you have made.

Mr. and Mrs. ZAC LENTZ.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

July 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We should like to congratulate you on your publicly critical attitude toward the administration's Vietnamese policy.

Not only is our position in Vietnam historically illegal and immoral, but it is tragically naive to suppose that a political-philosophic movement can be halted with guns. We have, in effect, advanced the cause of communism by meddling in Vietnam. We should never have been in that country, and whatever tenuous support we had originally from a singularly corrupt, nonrepresentative government is gone. It would appear that due to a recurring, pathological fear of communism, we are being taken down a garden path with patriotic platitudes masking a radioactive end.

We regret that the Senators from Illinois are not able to approach the beginnings and the end of the Vietnamese question as rationally and intelligently as you are. It is regrettable that they show no inclination to stop the blind rush to disaster, but we are grateful for your continued efforts to bring some sense to our policymakers.

Very truly yours,

CARLA C. WILDE.

CORNING, ARK.,

July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The attached column of Walter Lippmann pretty well expresses the opinion I have of our involvement in the Vietnam conflict.

In the first place, I am more or less of a loss to know what we are doing there. In the second place, that area appears as a poor place to have drawn a line in a stand against Communist expansion.

I think that if we had conducted our diplomacy right we could have pitted Russia against China and restricted our policeman role to the Western Hemisphere.

It appears that we sometime go out of our way to get involved in the internal affairs of some undeveloped country. While pretending to contain communism in some far corner of the world, we suffer it to gain a foothold at our very doorstep.

It would certainly shock the world if we admitted our mistake and withdrew our forces from Vietnam. It is often said that it takes a big man to admit his errors. I doubt if we have this kind of big men in control of our affairs.

I have observed with interest your position on some of our foreign affairs issues. I hear many expressions of concern locally about the position of our administration in current foreign affairs.

Very respectfully yours,

BRYAN J. MCCALLEN.

NORTH BERGEN, N.J.,

July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I find myself in a very difficult position as do friends of mine and others whom I have talked to. I love my country, not in a chauvinistic way, but because of its historical roots, its people, the land itself, and the possibilities that exist here for the development of the human being. All these things I love, however, are now threatened by developments in American foreign policy. The greatest threat to human development is not communism, but perversion of those ideals which America has always claimed to believe in. We have become a nation that is increasingly willing to violate its own professed standards of freedom and justice out of an unhealthy and irrational fear of communism. That word has come to mean to us what the word devil meant to our Puritan ancestors. This fear has driven us to a course of aggression and violation of the right to self-determination in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. We are pursuing policies, especially in Vietnam, that can only lead to increased suffering and the decline in moral force of the United States, if not to the destruction of our whole civilization. I love my country, but I cannot support it. I believe in the ideals that we profess, and they must be practiced, not just given lip service. It is the discovery that my country and its government does not always believe in them and is willing to condone grave violations of those ideals that hurts most. The only course that I can see for persons like myself is to refuse to cooperate with our Government until it changes its immoral, illegal, and dangerous foreign policy. I urge you to use the power and influence of your office to seek a sane and just path to world order, and I congratulate you on the valiant effort that you have made to date.

Sincerely,

RONALD MOTTRAM.

BALTIMORE, MD.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read portions of your speech before the SANE rally in Madison Square Garden, and I want you to know that I appreciate your efforts to bring before the people what the administration and other leaders do not want to discuss. I do hope you will continue to exert your influence to get our Government to work harder

in the direction of getting a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

EDWARD BRODY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Don't you think that the right to declare war should remain in the hands of our Congress? Or does the word "emergency" nullify our Constitution?

Please insist that the right to declare war be returned to the representatives of the people who must fight those wars. Please open debate on our Vietnamese participation. Please question our course.

We are burning and bombing, torturing and murdering in the name of "U.S. honor." This is not my conception of our honor. Is it yours?

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to our President today.

Sincerely,

ELEANORE SELK.

P.S.: I wish you unlimited courage, initiative, and support. You are a voice for sanity. Perhaps this letter to our President may interest you.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

July 31, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Isn't it time we encouraged the Vietnamese people to talk to each other?

If South Vietnam Government representatives will negotiate with the Vietcong a government may emerge which represents the South Vietnamese.

I am tired of this war. I am ashamed of our participation, of our bombing and our slogans. I am terrified of your promise of escalation and even annihilation.

Let's not make this our war. We were called in as middlemen. Now is the time to step aside and promote negotiations between the warring South Vietnamese Government and its Vietcong.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR SELK.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Consider bombing near Chinese border extremely provocative. Urge immediate submission of problem to U.N.

Mr. and Mrs. HUGH E. HENSHAW.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Stop ruthless bombing and killing. Start talking in United Nations for world peace.

JACQUELINE GALLI.

JULY 28, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:

Thank God for your ability to voice your convictions so strongly. I am with you 100 percent and I think I would explode if I did not hear you voice my convictions against the behavior of our Government. I sit here helpless, convinced that the United States is behaving badly. Thank God again for you.

I have found a new faith, the Bahai faith, a faith with a plan for a Godly world government. I understand Woodrow Wilson's sister was a Bahai and no doubt the President got his idea for the League of Nations from her. Now we have the U.N. along the same line. Rome was not made in a day,

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18439

and if we persevere we may bring to fruition the projected plan of Bahauallah, a prophet with a message for this new era.

If you are not familiar with this faith I believe you might benefit immensely by getting some of the literature.

I went from church to church looking for a solution to solve the corruptness of our country. I found the faith I had in mind, a faith with a plan for coexistence. Now I am thinking in a straight line which is a comfort and I must again say: Thank God for you, who can express so aptly my desires for the United States.

I have 19 grandchildren. Five wonderful children. We made the grade in spite of our inequality in our economy. I hope we can build a semblance of equality.

Thank you again for your fairness to all peoples.

CLARICE GRAHAM.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
July 28, 1965.

Re Vietnam mail.

DEAR SENATOR: Today I read an article in the Christian Science Monitor entitled, "Viet Malls Run Light in Senate." This article stated that the Vietnam mail to Senators is falling off but that the percentage of protest against the military buildup is still running high.

The Vietnam mail is running low, because the American public is not only uninformed but, worse yet, it is misinformed. For the former they are to blame, but for the latter you Senators are to blame, unless you, too, have been taken in by the frightening blandishments of the Pentagon, and unless you, too, are unaware of the facts of history, past and present, concerning Vietnam.

If you are not aware of these facts, read the recent speeches of Senators WAYNE MORSE, FULBRIGHT, and GRUENING (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). Armed with this undisputable information, certainly you would have the courage to join ranks with these men and make all possible haste to inform and arouse the complacent, indifferent American public about Vietnam and the inevitable, useless massacre of Americans and orientals which is going to take place if offensive ground action is taken over by American forces—to what end?

Your job is to help the gullible, brain-washed Americans to save themselves rather than to sell them down the river to our military-industrial complex for a profit.

Those who know the score are begging you for assistance.

Yours truly,

ARCH R. MAULSBY.

P.S.—Has the U.S. Senate abdicated its constitutional right to declare or not to declare war?

NEWBURG PARK, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank God for men of courage, like yourself, sir, who see the disaster ahead and who are not afraid to speak out the truth.

The appalling side thought is that so-called intelligent statesmen (I will not dignify the military with this adjective) learn nothing from the history of Napoleon, Hitler, et al., and expect to wage a successful war with such over extended supply lines, so close to the enemy and so far from home.

I am writing, as I have from the onset, to President Johnson, HUBERT HUMPHREY, the late Mr. Stevenson, etc., in protest of our insane policy, but I feel a positive note to you is much more constructive, and will be counted among the many, many thousands I am sure you receive.

I, for the first time in my 45 years walked a precinct, in the heart of this John Birch Society area, in behalf of Mr. Johnson be-

cause of the policies he once claimed but has now abandoned.

If, in the next presidential election, it should be possible to work for one, Senator WAYNE MORSE, I know I shall work even harder, and no matter what the results, I shall not wind up with the taste of bitter ashes in my mouth.

Sincerely,

CHARLES S. BRUCK.

WEST HEMPSTEAD, N.Y.,
July 30, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It seems desperate to think this way, but I am finally convinced that the only way that the American people, and the people in this planet can avoid extreme disaster or extinction, is for those who clearly see what McNamara and the Pentagon gang are up to, to start a new political party. It is obvious that neither of the two major parties as constituted today offer the slightest hope. A new political party has to have as its principles, a foreign policy of real peace and living together with other nations through the U.N. regardless of their political orientation. Let us realize, that the Communist nations have not been military aggressors, but we have and constantly are.

I feel that you or people around you who support you could assume the leadership of such a party, and I am sure that, even though you will be vilified, and called names, many thousands and maybe millions of college people, intellectuals, rank and file workers, and certainly mothers, will rally to the banner of a party of real peace and decent rights for all.

I hope that you can consider this matter carefully. I feel that it not only has merit, but hope. It is the only thing I can think of that does.

Yours very truly,

DR. L. FRANK.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

MR. SENATOR: I am writing you to express how much I appreciate the fight you are waging against the war in Vietnam and I would like to know how they know how the American people think. I want you to know that I and many others think as you do. Keep up the good work.

Many good wishes,

I. B. KINGSBURY.

ISSAQUAH, WASH.,
July 29, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Despite the lateness of the hour, it surely is not too late to stage a debate on the conduct and ultimate goals of the war in Vietnam. At least we have that coming to us. The most deadly serious actions and commitments are made in the name of us all by a series of virtual executive fiat. I am convinced that the role of a Member of the Congress of the United States is not to simply melt into a "patriotic" mass known as a consensus every time a contretemps arises outside our borders. There exists a great vacuum waiting to be filled by a genuine opposition. As far as I can see by reading what is vouchsafed to us as suitable, Congress acts more or less as a rubber stamp whenever the combined weight and prestige of the President and his military advisers is brought to bear.

How many years are we prepared to occupy South Vietnam? North Vietnam? Do we intend to wipe out entirely the Vietcong insurgents from the face of the earth—if this were possible? Are we prepared to take on China on the ground? Are we looking for some trumped-up excuse dreamed up in the military circles for bombing China's nu-

clear establishments? Will we launch into another "Vietnam" in Thailand? Cambodia? Are we to police the whole of southeast Asia? Are we to fall all over ourselves to rush to the beck and call of any threatened regime, anywhere, regardless of how unworthy and inept, when the local politicians cry "Communist wolf?"

Has anyone pointed out, when all the horrified murmurs about "loss of prestige" come up when it is suggested we think up a quick way out of Vietnam, that the French suffered a disastrous defeat in that wretched country, and pulled out ignominiously. French prestige, French prosperity have never been higher in years than at this time. France is universally admired and fawned upon by those very peoples one would have expected to gloat and crow and never allow her to forget what happened in Indochina.

After four and a half years in England and Canada I grew accustomed to lively and thorough parliamentary debates, where no quarter was given or expected. I returned home recently and find myself dismayed at the lack of discussion, the poor reportage on what the opinions of Members of Congress actually are on foreign affairs.

I'm very happy to see, however, that Senator Morse is still functioning as an excellent approximation of a full-scale opposition, and as the conscience of the Senate. I salute you, sir.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. CECILE H. BOSTROM.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I support your position on the war in Vietnam and I have finally started to write some letters about it. The reason I am writing you is to ask you for suggestions about who I should write to. I don't flatter myself that my letters will carry much weight, but I know they will carry more of whatever weight they have if they get to the right place. Please help me.

Thank you,

MRS. JOHN MARSH.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 28, 1965.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your stand on the Vietnam war.

It is gratifying to know that there is at least one man in Congress with the courage to publicly oppose our current policy.

Thank you for your efforts.

Yours very truly,

MARY S. LEPPALA.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Thank you for your efforts to bring peace in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and especially, in Vietnam.

We are fortunate in your intelligence, energy, scholarship, courage, and good will.

HARRY MARSHAK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Several days ago I returned home after a fortnight in the hospital where I enjoyed the advantages of mid-20th century medicine and surgery to find myself once again in a world in part still governed by principles of the stone age.

Previously I had addressed myself to you on the subject of our policies and conduct in southeast Asia. The events of recent months force me again to protest against them. The talk should not be of national honor but of national preservation, not of

18440

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

international responsibilities but of international morality.

To think that the other side can be driven to the negotiating table by force of arms is to deny all knowledge and understanding of human thinking and action. Negotiations can never be undertaken if one side announces in advance what it demands for satisfaction, for, then, what would be the reason for negotiating?

The blasphemous morality of equating our side with God and assigning the other to the anti-Christ, of confusing what is God's with what is Caesar's, with assuming that political and economic systems unlike our own are damned, all this may confuse and lead astray the thoughtless among our own citizens, but not the thoughtful here and abroad.

May I urge you to temper our policies so that among us it will again be recognized that "Blessed are the peacemakers," that our country be known for its moral might, not its military power.

I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to Senators KUCHEL, MURPHY, GRUENING, and MORSE.

Yours respectfully,

S. M. RABSON, M.D.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.

July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every so often we, in this snug little, snug little, low-key pitched news media area—get rumbling usually television—of that healthy voice from the northwest United States, last stand of the "Bill of Rights and the Constitution," which you have so long and faithfully and dedicatedly and tirelessly represented in Congress. Your long and principled devotion to the democratic ideals to which our country has aspired (until Hiroshima and Nagasaki and its compromises with the Nazi's in W. Germany)—deserve eulogies by your constituency; casts a real light of political "enlightenment" upon the State you represent and shines like a neon sign in a desert of gloom. Long may you voice the principles, ideas and practicality in a precarious age—of international peace and universal brotherhood of man.

And like Abou ben Adam: May your tribe increase! And I say—to Democrats and Republicans and Liberals alike sabre rattling bomb—poise breathing forth threads and bombast of all world tyrannies—"a plague in all your houses." A party of peace unconditional peace, global peace is the only party (and its candidate for public office I shall ever support again). I nominate you to search such out.

Anyway thank you for your opposition to the "military-industrial complex"—Pentagon, "face savers" in the administration; unilateralists in foreign policy Congresses. Men—and all such public common weal—disservicers—Congress should reassume by repealing Government by crisis, powers, it has delegated to the President over the years since 1950. And never again any administration such absolute power as the U.S. Presidency wields.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MILDRED O'TOOLE.

YARNELL, ARIZ.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I know I'm not one of your constituents, but I should like to congratulate you for your courage to stand up for what you believe.

What I can't understand is why we send our men to Vietnam to fight for the freedom of colored people, when we deny that same freedom to the colored citizens in our own country.

I wonder what the President and the Congress would do if Africa or China or Russia, were to send soldiers and bombs to the United States to fight for the freedom of our Negroes.

I, too, believe we are rushing into world war III.

I thank you for your support for peace.

Sincerely yours,

ULA BAIRD.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

July 31, 1965.

WAYNE MORRIS,
Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a copy of a letter I sent to President Johnson today.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH SIEGEL.

"Dear President Johnson: Wednesday, St. Louis Post Dispatch, July 28, 1965, has an interview by Larry Johnson, American Broadcasting Co., on his return to St. Louis for treatment of grenade wounds. He was asked how the war in Vietnam had changed since 3 years ago when he was there. He said the only difference was the war was now expanded. And now the Vietnamese couldn't care less which side wins."

"Is this the freedom we are drafting our sons for? To die in a jungle 12,000 miles from Washington, D.C.?"

"President Kennedy said the Vietnamese have to fight this out. Now we are combat troops, no longer advisers. The Saturday Evening Post's Stewart Alsop says 58 percent of the American people do not support the war in Vietnam. Please call a halt to the shooting—cease fire—and then negotiate."

"Yours truly,

JOSEPH SIEGEL."

Copies to: WAYNE MORSE, Senator, Oregon; Huntley-Brinkley Report, NBC-TV.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems to me that there is only one way to stop President Johnson dead in his tracks on the Vietnam situation, and that is by setting up committees in every city of any size to collect signatures to be sent to congressional Representatives and Senators calling for the immediate impeachment of the President violating the Constitution of our country and for reneging on his campaign pledges. I've sounded out a lot of people, in all walks of life, and they think it would catch and go like wildfire. But it takes someone prominent in political life to launch the thing. You could do it.

I'm an oldtime ex-union organizer. I've learned that to be effective when you are unable to stop someone you must go for his throat. And a threat of impeachment, merely the gathering of hundreds of thousands of signatures, would be a real lunge for the President's vulnerable jugular vein. I'm convinced it would work. And I know of no other way to get him to listen to reason.

I hope you will seriously consider this step.

Sincerely,

EMANUEL J. FRIED.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

July 28, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May the good God strengthen you in your marvelous courage to uphold sanity and human values in this deplorable condition in which we of the United States have become embroiled.

It seems to me the Senate is letting us the people down. Acquiescence is given each new rapid step in the escalation, no

matter what individual Senators have previously said about the need for careful exploration of the entire Vietnam situation, if it developed further.

Two things call for most careful, conscientious probing.

First. The President's declaration that our cause is just.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide etc."

Second. Today the President said the present course might take many years in its completion.

This latter is a terrific statement given as a "plausible possibility."

How can our Congress fail to open the whole situation, lest this brings the end of Western civilization? How blind are we?

You are our one greatest champion. Our fervent appreciation and earnest prayers are yours.

Very sincerely,

HILDA A. FOSTER.

LANSING, MICH.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my thanks for your firm opposition to the Vietnam situation. The voices of opposition are so few, and so quickly stifled.

We said goodbye to our only son last night as he left for that war, and we cannot, in spite of all we have read, studied, or listened to, give ourselves any good reason for his going. We have had years of evasion, secrecy and lies, so why should the American people now believe anything coming out of Washington? The President does not know, nor can he ever, the tears of a mother, father, wife or child. That is nauseating hogwash.

Please continue your stand. There are those of us who applaud you, and thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. T. A. LUCAS.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to convey to you my deepest respect and admiration and thanks for the courageous role you have taken upon yourself on the question of United States involvement in Vietnam. I believe that you personally are responsible to a large degree for the increasing willingness of our Government to take this matter before the United Nations. I also believe that through your speeches before the Senate and by your personal appearances, such as at the Madison Square Garden rally of June 8, you have given strength and hope to millions of Americans who protest our role in Vietnam. As one who has been involved in this struggle for the past several months I can testify to how easy it is to lose heart and get discouraged as more and more men are sent over, and how much it means to have someone who is part of the power structure of this country who is willing to speak out against our role. I don't know what the outcome of this struggle will be, but if our Government does decide to take this matter directly before the United Nations and will agree to abide by their decision, I believe I will be justified in thinking that you played a great role in preventing the possible destruction of all of mankind. No man can possibly do more.

With my profound respect, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JONATHAN LEVY.

DULUTH, MINN.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I wish to add my support that I, too, am very much against this war in Vietnam.

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18441

There must be some way that this could be settled around the conference table.

I do not agree with President Johnson for I fear that the war will get larger and take more and more young men.

I served 3 years in World War II and I know what war is.

But to get into a war with China and that is the way it seems to be going could take an awful toll of life.

I am glad, Senator, that we can turn to someone in this crisis.

Thank you.

DAVID E. OPIEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for bringing before the people the fact that President Johnson has no right to make war without a declaration by Congress.

He is dragging us into a ridiculous swamp like Korea and possibly over the brink into a holocaust.

Since he talks about honoring promises, he has a promise to honor that he made to the American people. He was elected on the basis that he was against war. Yet his foreign policy is so weak that the only way he knows how to implement it is by waging war.

I certainly hope that more Members of Congress speak up. I am, of course, writing to my own Senators, however I wanted to write and thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. B. SHAFRAN.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to commend you on the views which you have expressed concerning the inadvisability of our Nation's policies on Vietnam. I hope that you will continue to articulate more reasonable solutions to our current problems of foreign policy.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. KIMBALL.

MELROSE, MASS., July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Because you have a long record of fearless and independent action, I am writing to say that I hope the Senate will not agree with the House in repeal of the "right to work" law now on the books. States should retain their present power to legislate on the subject, and individuals should retain their present rights to employment without union membership. Surely there are economic as well as civil liberties that need to be defended. Also, the unions have become too powerful for the public good. Congress should not aid the unions further.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH NIXON.

KENSINGTON, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to express my gratitude to you for your untiring efforts to argue and promote a rational solution of the war in Vietnam.

How unfortunate for this country that there are so few others in its government with your courage and integrity.

Sincerely yours,

S. A. ANDRES.

KELLY, KELLY & KELLY,
JACKSON, MICH., July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people support and applaud your standup fight against the slaughter of American boys in Vietnam.

Keep it up.

Yours very truly,

PHILLIP C. KELLY.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With today's announcement that the Viet war is being expanded there is more than ever the need for your loyal opposition. Others in high office have feared to speak out against the administration's terrible mistake, and now there will be fewer. Even the people around here appear dazed as to what is happening; there is certainly no flag waving among the general public because what they thought was nothing has suddenly become a real threat, and they are mumbling to themselves asking "What has happened?"

We Americans have been blessed with too few leaders of experience, wisdom, and liberal vision. Liberalism, the patient and reasonable defense of our way of life, is the only existent and truly effective alternative to marxism. The present administration has lowered themselves to a crass and unwise method of dealing with the "marxism" that is being displayed in the "underdeveloped countries." America needs your voice, your leadership, and your far-sighted wisdom.

There is a large body of sentiment against the war; it is not being expressed in public; the fear is too great. But you do have a silent support—but maybe even more important you have the support of history.

Sincerely,

C. FRED BLAKE.

KNUEPPEL'S,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please persist in the attitude you have taken against the Vietnam fiasco. We are with you 100 percent.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. HILBERT H. KNUEPPEL.

R. L. RICHARDSON, D. C.,
Pittsford, Pa., July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I urge you to continue your efforts in extricating us from the Vietnam solution? This policeman of the world bit betrays the San Francisco conference on peace. Let the U.N. be the policeman not the United States of America.

Sincerely,

R. L. RICHARDSON, D.C.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In an article appearing in the Ann Arbor News you are named as the one and only Senator who has the fortitude to oppose L. B. Johnson's steamroller, as far as Vietnam is concerned.

Well, I am thankful that there is someone in Washington to speak for a host of citizens who voted for L.B.J. because they were led to believe that he was a "sane, peace-loving man" and who are now thoroughly disillusioned.

It is a tragedy that the other Senators

are such a cowardly lot, intimidated by right-wing fanatics who would brand them as Communists.

Perhaps if you persist you can bring the power mad war lords in the White House and the Pentagon Building and the Senate to their senses before the world is engulfed in a fearful holocaust.

Respectfully,

LAURA GETZ,

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES.

DEAR SIR: I listened to President Johnson during his press conference on Vietnam, and I recalled that when he was running for election in November 1964, he called Barry Goldwater trigger happy, which now can well apply to Johnson. What one cannot forget is the promise that if elected he would not escalate the war in Vietnam. Evidently, those were false promises in order to get the people to vote him into office. He would never have received the overwhelming vote that he got from both Democrats as well as Republicans if the American people had an inkling that he would bring them to this pass—where our young men would once again find themselves giving up their freedom and their lives in this atomic age, which bodes ill for all humanity. The atom bomb was supposed to have been a deterrent to war—now look what is happening.

President Johnson is a good politician, but not a wise statesman, representing a powerful Nation. It is easy to become involved in war, but it takes wisdom to know how to avoid one. Johnson has surrounded himself with the wrong advisers—the military mind—the CIA—McNamara—Bundy, et al.

This is an undeclared war because President Johnson fears that the Congress would not support him in this drastic step of escalation which may bring on a Third World War that spells madness. While there is still time, the American people should openly express themselves against this threatened holocaust which should be avoided at all costs.

It is either going to be coexistence or no existence.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EVA WILLIAMS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Since in my own district we get so little cooperation from our Representatives in the Congress we have to appeal to others on a nationwide basis.

The enclosed is a letter I am sending to the Members of Congress far and wide and to let the few great leaders among you know the citizens are aroused.

The situation looks very dark at the moment, but I try to believe that the darkest hour maybe before the dawn.

Thank you for your wise leadership.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALICE B. HASKINS.

I am having copies of this letter made to send to Senators as well as Representatives.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 1, 1965.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the June 21 issue of the Nation (which this year is celebrating its 100th anniversary) I would call your attention to an editorial under the head of "Where's Congress?" It points to the fact that Congress has not been relieved of the responsibility for the consequences of Presidential action in committing the United States to hostilities against other states. In failing to actively assume this responsibility, the Congress has, by its inaction and abdication, nullified the Constitution. With about

18442

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

two dozen exceptions, this is literally true, thus the war in Asia rises to increasing heights of mutual peril, not to mention what is happening in the other Americas.

There is no logic known to man that can justify the ruthlessness of our foreign policy in waging war. It is tragically reminiscent of the Hitler period and I am wondering if, when this situation has reached the point of no return, the American people will claim, as the Germans did, "We were unaware." There is no way we can escape responsibility for the death and destruction being perpetrated either on a neighboring state or on a people half a world away.

We look to those we have elected to responsible places in Government to take leadership in seeking solutions which will bring peace to a war-torn world. The people are still awaiting that leadership. As a loyal American citizen, one who has lived through many wars and knows the futility of them, I beg of you to stop this mad drive toward world destruction. The more concerned a citizen becomes the more suspect he is.

This insane fear of communism will surely be our ultimate destruction if we do not return to reason.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALICE B. HOSKINS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 26, 1965.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The purpose of this missive is twofold, to thank you and to encourage you.

First, I wrote you last fall asking for certain information and copies of speeches that you have made in the past. Your response was immediate, exciting, and more than I dared hope for. But, alas, I wait until now to thank you.

Moreover I wish to thank you for your consistent positions on such matters as foreign aid, education, and international law.

Second, I encourage you to continue your work with the same zeal that you have heretofore shown.

I would remind you of a statement of President Wilson, one that you doubtless already keep in mind. I refer to his statement in reference to "Fighting Bob," prior to our entrance into the First World War, wherein he stated that Mr. La Follette represented no opinion but his own.

I hereby go on record as stating that your expressions represent my opinion and my position.

Warmly and cordially yours,

IRA L. LOWERY,
Superior Court Clerk, Los Angeles
County, Calif.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel that your comments on the Vietnam situation are most perceptive, and, from the historical point of view, will eventually be proven to be highly profound. You must, therefore, exert all possible efforts to prevent the loss of any more American lives defending remote jungle outposts populated by ignorant barbarians.

I can see no justification for the defense of any territory whose people generally do not understand the implications of life in a Marxist society and would tolerate elected officials with pro-Communist views. For these reasons I feel that the American forces should be immediately pulled out of Vietnam, and that the U.S. Government should concede all territory to the Communists up to, and including, the State of Oregon, with the defense perimeter established at the Oregon State line.

Very truly yours,

EMIL M. MURAD.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Glad to hear you speak out about the powers of the President not being dictatorial.

We certainly need many more men such as you in Congress these days. I do hope you will not drop the fight, but keep on until we return to the constitutional form of government.

Yours very truly,

EUGENE F. BROWN.

JULY 31, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: What little news we get in our local Seattle press about you, plus your statements over the radio—are all very welcome. Yours is one of the few voices of sanity in the country when values seem upside down. Please keep up this fine courageous stand. If your office has copies of any of your policy speeches, I'd like a few copies. Thank you.

JOY FULLERTON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 28, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

It will always be our actions that speak to the peoples of the world, no matter how we rationalize in words—and the continuation of the acceleration of the war in Vietnam is an act of stubborn perversity, not wisdom. Eventually we shall provoke a conflagration we cannot stop, let alone cope with.

New complex social, political and economic problems exist in the world which cannot be solved by the old show-of-force technique. Greater numbers of our fighting men in Vietnam will only force Russia closer to Red China, and Red China will be forced by our aggressive "invitations" into war. No matter what one's color or politics * * * when one is hit again and again, one will eventually strike back.

When will the leaders of our country and shapers of our foreign policy learn that by swallowing just some of our pride and actively backing down to peaceful negotiations (which may seem to our military minded, a "loss of face"), we, in the long run, will raise our stature in the eyes of the world.

What is the price of our brand of democracy in southeast Asia? Slaughter of innocents as well as the Vietcong? Total war? Step by step you are leading us toward the latter. I for one have been ashamed of being an American since we stepped up our aggression. This is not what I voted for, nor condone. And having spent nearly half of last year traveling in Europe, I know what the peoples of those countries thought of Goldwater's policies. They were appalled. When will we ever learn?

To sum up: Whatever the causes for the war in Vietnam, the reasons (which remain very cloudy) for any continuation, any step-up, have too high a price in human lives and in American dollars. The money that is being spent to keep us in Asia could far better be spent in cleaning up our own many problems at home. It is ironic to compare the sums being spent for the Peace Corps, poverty program and beautification of America with the total daily cost of this undeclared war. We are rapidly undoing whatever good we have done with our Peace Corps program. And as for the cost in human lives (what is the "price" of a human life?) * * * any realistic and reasonable thought should lead one to conclude that we cannot win any war with numbers of fighting men in Asia. Can't we learn from France's bitter experience?

Shall we learn only when our own homeland is finally bombed? Perhaps we shall have deserved it for we are now committing murder in Vietnam—while remaining ignorant at home.

JOY FULLERTON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your viewpoint of Vietnam and Santo Domingo, and if more members of the executive and legislative branches of our Government knew more history we would not be in the mess in which we are mired.

I wish that every member of Government would read the article by historian Arnold Toynbee entitled "We Must Woo Red China" in the July 17, 1965, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Toynbee's treatise supports your contentions, and the article should be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,

D. W. MILLER.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to extend my support and solidarity to you and your colleagues, especially Senator GRUENING, for carrying on the campaign against our involvement in Vietnam. About a year ago, President Johnson stated publicly that as long as he is President, no action of his will be in the direction of provoking war. He was elected to office largely on the strength of this promise, which he has subsequently violated.

I would appreciate your sending me reprints of any material you may have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or any other news media. Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

LOWELL J. SATRE, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a mother have written President draft increase. Appreciate your stand on Vietnam.

SYLVIA SHULMAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a mother have written President draft increase. Appreciate your stand on Vietnam.

MOLLIE KANAREK.

LAS VEGAS, NEV.,
July 28, 1965.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I fully agree with you about our involvement in Asia. I do hope the lawmakers heed your warning before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ARTHUR KISTLER.

MORGANTOWN, W. VA.,
July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not a constituent, technically, but feel that you serve me well. Too often, I'm sure, American Congressmen receive correspondence of demands or complaints with laurels too thinly interspersed. I would like to take this opportunity, however, to commend you on your intelligent and forthright stand on the grave Vietnamese issue. The praise is better deserved for your long and continued opposition to our policy.

Although there are those who would have us believe, however fantastic, that America's interests are best served in the rice

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18443

paddies of a nation involved in civil war, there are also those of more mature reflection who believe that American integrity and safety are being compromised.

The cry is arising for preventative war against China. We have had "war hawks" in the past. History pronounces their epitaph as the wailing of idiots. Enough American blood has been spilled in this century, not to speak of the wanton slaughter of Europe's and Asia's millions, with no resolution of the problems. Will we not learn that war creates more problems than it solves?

Our people need proper medical care, our children need good teachers, our cities need hospitals, our rivers and streams are sorely polluted. Yet we callously spend the majority of our national budget for military purposes. Surely, Americans, indeed all people, deserve better. For when we involve ourselves in war we are involving all others. The responsibility for wise leadership and wise behavior rests with the preponderance of power. The gargantuan stands guilty as accused of misusing its power.

Men, particularly leaders of men, appear to be more warlike than peaceable. Consequently the burden of proof and debate rests with the advocates of peace who constitute the minority. But, for the sake of mankind, the mission of peace is vastly important and must be diligently pursued.

To you, sir, America owes a debt of gratitude, for you serve America well.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE HOLLIDAY.

EAST STROUDSBURG, Pa.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I share your concern over the deepening and dangerous involvement in Vietnam. I believe that if the President is arrogating to himself the power to conduct war without a specific resolution from Congress to that effect by the constitutional mandate, then impeachment proceedings are in order. It is, I think, imperialism of a most blatant kind.

As Norman Mailer said at a recent Harvard discussion, "He shares the insanity that is in all of us." The spending on arms, the moon race, and such simple things as building highways and killing more people by the automobile.

As Professor Seymour Melman says in his recent book, "Our Depleted Society," we are tied too much to the military, our defense spending and research is throwing the rest of development out of kilter.

So, I thank you for adding your very powerful and influential voice in what must seem like a quite lonely wilderness, and the few other Senators and Congressmen as well who have risked Presidential displeasure as opposing such wilful and arrogant actions.

Sincerely,

GLEN FISHER.

WHITESTONE, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Never before have I written to any Senator about any issue, however, I am finally moved to do just that because of the courageous stand taken by you regarding the indefensible position the President has taken in the Vietnam adventure. I admire your intellectual honesty in pursuing a course advocating the widest possible discussion and scrutiny by both branches of the legislature in conformity with our Constitution. It seems, indeed, as if too many of our legislators prefer political expediency to discharging their duty.

A copy of this letter is being mailed to your colleagues, Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS, for, after all they are my representatives and they should be aware why one of their constituents feels impelled to write to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Please be assured of my deep gratitude for the valiant fight you are conducting for all of us.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK SIMON.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR: Regarding your position in the current Vietnam crisis:

I thank God that there is a man in the Senate with your commonsense and understanding of the value of human beings. My husband and I truly admire you for your reluctance to go barging into a situation that obviously will never be resolved by dropping bombs and sending troops.

I pray that your efforts are rewarded. Please never stop striving for peace. We want our children to live in a world without constant fear and possible destruction.

God bless you.

Respectfully yours,

AURORA DOHERTY.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I have never written to a public person I must say I echo my wife's sentiments. God bless you in your fight for peace and commonsense.

JOHN DOHERTY.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.,
July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First, congratulations for your necessary response to the President's address this afternoon. As far as I'm concerned, we are in the words of Governor Hatfield "being run and told what to do by a few experts." As for me, I agree with people like yourself, Senator GRUENING, Walter Lippmann, and Drew Pearson.

I want you to know that you have many supporters all over the country and as for myself (me?) you're my favorite Senator—perhaps because—quite bluntly—you don't give a damn about your colleagues and you've the guts not to go along and be a yes-man—because Johnson says so. I have been solidly behind you ever since I can remember (I'm only 16) possibly because in my eyes—you're the epitome of a person who believes wholeheartedly in the welfare of not only his country—but the world.

You don't propose to be a messiah to the Negro—as Senator ROBERT KENNEDY—yet you show your true colors by voting against that segregationist Coleman—whereas "Mr. Everything" voted for him.

I disagree with our policy on South Vietnam. 1. We have no right to be there and if it were any country in there but us—all would break loose. 2. L.B.J. constantly refers to the "aggressors" but are we the epitome of peace when we bomb North Vietnam? We are always the good guys.

It is a civil war in South Vietnam and it's none of our business and they're not even fighting for the people of that land—they fight blindly against the Vietcong—they (the Marines) bear a resemblance to the Birchites as they seek out and kill the "Reds."

I could go on and on and on but I don't want to consume your time—I just want you to please, please, please do all you can to convince Senators to vote nay concerning the money L.B.J. will ask for to finance the war and please—don't ever give in and never feel as though you have no support—you have a lot.

Sincerely,

ROSANNE HELLER.

BRONX, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter to you because yours has consistently been a voice of reason in the Vietnam crisis.

After hearing the President's news conference yesterday, I find myself dismayed in the extreme at the continued pursuit of what I feel to be a disastrous course.

This is a military operation which, in my opinion, we cannot win, if by that we mean causing the enemy to sue for peace or our terms. Both sides concede that this could go on for 5 years or more. Aside from "side issues" of what happens to Vietnam and its people in this period, as we use up more of our own young men and materiel in this bottomless pit, the pressures for the use of nuclear armaments will increase, with catastrophic results we can only vaguely imagine.

I am writing to ask you, how an individual can register a protest so as to at least cause the juggernaut to pause a moment before it crushes everyone in its headlong dash? To whom can one write or speak in order to arouse some meaningful opposition to this course?

I really would appreciate an answer from you.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR HUFFMAN.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

My DEAR SENATOR: Stop Johnson at all costs. Get out and come home. If he must have a war, throw Castro out. Our gold is gone, our silver is gone, and we are busted now. A big war is our finish.

STANLEY K. HALBERT, M.D.

LAKEWOOD, OHIO.

DEAR SENATOR: You, Senator, and your colleague from Alaska are the only men in Washington who are not frightened silly by communism. France and Italy have had large Communist Parties for years and even their nations are ruled by Communists. We are wasting men, money, and materials in Vietnam.

Cannot you give a little of your courage and backbone to our present leader?

D. LOHMEIER.

P.S.—Wish you had a chance of becoming President.

JULY 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Heard your comment on President Johnson's policy speech. Amen. May I thank you and commend you for your honesty and courage. Our Constitution and our elected officers' oaths are more precious than any political or military advantage.

ARTHUR E. SPENCER.

FORT WAYNE, IND.

July 20, 1965.

DEAR AMERICAN: I hope you keep up your fight as you have. I think your stand is morally, logically correct.

Success to you and to all of us and the world if you win.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONLEY, M.D.

JULY 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Is there any way I, as a citizen, can help you and your all-too-few rational colleagues restore sanity to our country's foreign policy. Why does President Johnson pursue a policy of ever-increasing military involvement in Vietnam? Does he really think we can bomb and burn people into being our friends? The publicized reasons of resisting aggression from North Vietnam and keeping South Vietnam free do not seem consistent with the facts of the Vietnam situation. Why doesn't our country encourage popularly supported resistance to oppressive authoritarian regimes such as in South Vietnam, Portugal, etc.? Why should we support an oppressive anti-Communist dictatorship any more than an oppressive Communist one? I can think of no justifiable reason, can you? I can think of no other reason than to preserve the foreign economic wealth of powerful and wealthy

18444

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

Americans and American corporations. I certainly hope there are other reasons, but what are they?

Can you suggest any organizations that I could work with in an effort to deflect President Johnson from his present course toward, I fear, a nuclear third world war?

Is there any way to replace President Johnson with someone as intelligent and sensitive as you as the Democratic Party presidential nominee in 1968, if we live that long? His actions concerning Vietnam, Latin America and U.N. finances have been so distasteful that I can never vote for him again.

I would appreciate any documentation of the inconsistencies of American Vietnam policies with facts that you have readily available, and want you to know that I support your efforts to bring reason, truth, and justice into play as the guiding principle of our country's actions in affairs with other countries.

Sincerely,

ROGER D. WOODS.

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We definitely agree with you taking your stand against our boys being murdered in Vietnam and also against Congress adjourning until this situation is settled.

Mrs. MARIE STEINBECK,
Mrs. GLORIA THOMAS.

AKRON, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your correct and courageous leadership of opposition to our involvement in Vietnam.

ARDATH ROSENBERG.

DENVER, COLO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are headed for disaster in Vietnam. Get us out of Vietnam immediately.

WILLIAM HANNAH,
World War II Veteran, Republican.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous stand against administration's Vietnam policy. Urge you continue vocal opposition.

Prof. and Mrs. MELVIN ROTHBERG.

JULY 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a private citizen, I feel sick at heart over the role of our country in Vietnam. In your recent remarks, you have expressed my sentiments and convictions very strongly.

I wish to commend you for your courage in speaking out. People like myself feel so impotent to alter the course of events. Perhaps men like yourself, in positions of responsibility, will be more successful.

I know you will continue to speak out as you have so often done in the past. May my expressions of approval give you some support.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. IRVINE A. WILCOX.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
July 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to President John-

son indicating my opposition to his policy in Vietnam.

I hope you may use it as evidence of some public support of your admirable attempts to change U.S. policy in Vietnam and Asia.

Respectfully,

GERALD D. BERREMAN.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
July 26, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am appalled at the military action being taken in my name and in the name of all Americans in Vietnam. I consider it to be foolhardy and immoral. Moreover, I am certain that it will achieve the opposite of its professed aims.

I feel betrayed as one who supported your candidacy for the presidency.

I have previously expressed my belief in this matter to you and to my Congressmen by letter. I have expressed my belief publicly on several occasions at debates and protest meetings in the Bay Area, including a talk before an audience in excess of 10,000 at the Vietnam Day "teach-in" held on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley in May. I have signed public statements opposing the war in Vietnam including the one sponsored by the "Scientists and Engineers for Johnson" decrying your failure to adhere to the policies implied and promised in your campaign.

I am endorsing and working for the Vietnam Day Committee of Berkeley in preparation for massive protests this fall. I endorse the Assembly of Unrepresented People To Declare Peace and the other, associated activities scheduled for Washington, D.C., August 6-9.

These are scattered, perhaps desperate, perhaps ineffective measures. They are the product of people who are seriously alarmed at the course of events. But these alarmed people are also informed people, thoughtful people and responsible people. The activities listed above are but a few of the many such being carried out by a significant proportion of the most informed and politically responsible segment of the American public—many of them in colleges and universities, many of them in the clergy, many of them in public service. Not a few of them (like myself) make the study of human behavior their life work; some of them (like myself) make the study of Asian society their specialty. They act urgently, perhaps desperately, but not foolishly or carelessly. They act from knowledge and conviction.

For an indication of the variety of activities in this realm, I would refer you to the recently initiated "Biweekly Information/Action Report of the Universities Committee" (Post Office Box 7228, Detroit, Mich.).

To those in positions of political power, such activities may appear useless, hopeless or even ridiculous. But they are not to be ridiculed. We find ourselves becoming implicated in military and political adventures which we find utterly reprehensible and indefensible. We cry out for sanity before it is too late for sanity. We do what we do because other means have been ignored.

We will continue to attempt to convey our interpretations, our facts and our convictions in ways which will be heard. Our responsibilities as citizens and as men compel us to do so. Many will resort to non-violent resistance, refusal to serve in the Armed Forces, refusal to pay income taxes, civil disobedience, to disrupt munitions shipments to Vietnam, etc. I have not found these means to be the appropriate ones. But if no others are effective, then surely these must be tried. Whether or not they will be effective, they at least disassociate their participants from the policies they protest. They draw attention to the fact of the protest and the sincerity of those protesting. They are an anguished cry, but a cry which

will be heard. It is a sad day if this is the only cry which will be heard.

At present I have taken steps to do two things to register my personal protest:

1. I have undertaken to resign my commission in the U.S. Air Force Reserve (in which I served actively, 1953-55).

2. I have refused to participate further in training programs for the Peace Corps or other governmental programs sending personnel to Asia. These programs are sheer hypocrisy in the present context. You cannot buy friends in India while you are killing potential friends in Vietnam, and I consider it immoral to attempt to do so.

These are two activities or affiliations which I repudiate in light of the immoral war with which they are associated.

I will henceforth do everything within my power and conscience to oppose that war. I am totally unconvinced by the doubletalk, doublethink, euphemism and hypocrisy with which that war is rationalized by Mr. Bundy and your other advisors, and by the Departments of State and Defense.

I wish with all my heart that before this country wades deeper into the morass which is that war, you would listen thoughtfully to its critics. Historians of the future, should there be some, will know that current U.S. policy is sheerest folly. If it is abandoned it will be no more than an unpleasant historical footnote. If it is not abandoned, it may well be the end of the book.

The present course is hopeless. There are alternatives as you well know. Please pursue them.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD D. BERREMAN.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Yours seems to me to be the most vigorous and consistent voice for peace now heard in our land.

I can't help remembering the virtually unanimous clamor after the Second World War condemning the German people for standing by while Hitler led them down the path to ruin. I mention this, not because I think the situation is in any sense analogous to ours today, but rather to emphasize that perhaps there is or ought to be some action ordinary people might take now before our country takes the final step in Vietnam.

I'm doing the usual things. But is there some political action one might undertake which could reverse the present trend? I'd like to help if I could. If this were a presidential election year, a lot of people would like to see you and Senators GRUENING and CHURCH join together. But what can be done now?

Respectfully,

H. V. YEAGER.

BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICH.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is inspired by your televised comments (of July 27, 1965) regarding the U.S. bombing of the two Russian-installed antiaircraft missile bases in North Vietnam. I should like to convey to you my wholehearted support and approval of the position you have taken in connection with this particular incident, and, more generally, of your opposition to the administration's entire policy in southeast Asia.

I, too, find it impossible to understand the President's policy in Vietnam. I believe it to be immoral, illegal, and dangerous. Moreover, even if one accepts the highly dubious administration premise that an American presence in southeast Asia is desirable, it

August 3, 1965

18445

would still seem that current American policy is the worst possible policy for achieving that goal. Indeed, it seems to me that our aggressive action is succeeding only in driving Hanoi into the arms of Peking—a consummation devoutly to be shunned.

I am keeping a file (for my own study and for display to my friends) of material relating to U.S. involvement in southeast Asia, which includes press clippings and publications of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I would be very grateful for any material which illustrates your own views that you would care to send me; especially welcome would be copies of your Senate speeches and public addresses on the subject.

Finally, I urge you to continue your very constructive opposition to the administration's policy in Vietnam, even though it seems to be falling on deaf ears at the White House. It is of no little comfort to those like myself who welcome evidences of sanity in the National Government to know that there are still a few reasonable men where they are so very necessary.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON C. GOSSARD,
Graduate Student in Philosophy, University of Michigan.

P.S.—I have just finished viewing the President's press conference, and unfortunately, my former fears are now increased. I still believe the matter should be submitted to a formal debate in the United Nations as a first step toward extricating ourselves from a wholly unwise entanglement in southeast Asia.

MORRISON'S LODGE,
Merlin, Oreg., July 25, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my feeling on the proposed gun bill S. 1592.

From all the press releases and information I have read on this bill it appears to me:

1. The proposed Dodd bill is not strictly aimed at law enforcement as Senator Dodd implies, but it is aimed at controlling and hindering gun transactions to all citizens, law abiding and otherwise. This raises the question, Is it your function to restrict firearms to all?

2. Senator ROBERT KENNEDY (which I think highly of) states, "Let's legislate nonviolence." As I recall the last attempt to legislate morality, prohibition, failed miserably. This is an absolute impossibility.

3. The license fees in section 3(a) will prove a hindrance to both sportsmen and the small businessman. I have a small business and would not be able to continue to sell ammunition if these fees were enacted. This is an example of which I am sure there are many.

4. Interstate shipments, by the individual for hunting or any other purpose of which there are thousands, will seriously hamper the sport hunting industry in many of our States. What do we gain by this sacrifice? I doubt seriously if the criminal will be dissuaded from his endeavors because of this law.

5. Is this suppression of guns a Federal problem? Certainly there is a big difference in States like New York and Montana.

I could go into quite a lengthy discussion on this bill and its different sections, however I will be brief, as I believe I have conveyed the main thought.

I would very much like to know what your stand is on this bill and if you intend to vote for or against its passage. Please consider the intent of this bill and how the proposed bill does not accomplish it.

A much better tool to accomplish the suppression of firearms in crime, would be H.R.

5642 introduced by BOB CASEY, of Texas. This bill is really against the criminal, not a bill to suppress firearms to the public under the guise of a threat against crime.

Sincerely,

B. A. HANTEN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Is it true that our young sons just out of high school are being sent to Vietnam after a few months' training? I have heard this story so often and have read newspaper accounts of the 18- and 19-year-olds fighting and dying in Asia. Why are we fighting the Asiatic Communists who are supported by Red China when many of our former allies are trading with Red China, thereby strengthening her against us?

Now we are going to double the draft call and perhaps call up the reserves, although we have hundreds of thousands of enlisted military holding down civilian jobs on our military posts. Why not send these men into the war since that is the purpose of the Armed Forces? The draftees and reserves could replace these men both here and in peaceful areas overseas, meanwhile getting additional training so that they could be used as replacements in the theater of war when needed.

When a man chooses the armed services as his lifetime career he does so with the full knowledge that he can be sent anytime, anywhere into whatever war the United States becomes involved. Why are we keeping these professional fighters back home or stationed in peaceful areas of the world and sending teenagers with a few months' training into hand-to-hand combat with a tough foe with years of training and combat experience? No wonder we are losing in Vietnam. Or is this war merely an elimination of excess World War II babies for whom there is not enough employment or college facilities at this time or in the future? Please, please do something to insure adequate training for our teenagers.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GERALD BADCLIFF,
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Right you are, Senator, about the U.N. and Vietnam. However, you, FORB, DIRKSEN, and others relax, take it easy, and cheerio, for efforts along the lines you suggest have been taking place by yours truly, and the administration, etc.—allies of late now, for weeks now; but Rome wasn't built in a day; right? Good luck. Wish me luck, too.

E. LANE.

BELLE HARBOR, N.Y.,
July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a student who is on the verge of being sucked into L. B. J. & Co.'s Vietnam idiosyncrasy, I want to express my sincere appreciation and respect for your position on this issue and your courage to speak out against the current horrible trend.

Your comment of today on the United States abandonment of the U.N., our last hope, seemed especially cogent and effective.

I am against this war, as you are. What steps do you think I can take in order to help try to avert the final catastrophe? We can't just sit back and frown quietly as we sink deeper and deeper. What can I do?

Unless it's too late. I hope it isn't.

With deep admiration,

JERRY L. AVORN.

BING-CRONIN & LEONARD
PERSONNEL, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 29, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a conservative Republican I am seldom able to agree with your policies. At this time however, I find that you are the only member of the Government who I can agree with. I commend your stand on the Vietnam crisis and urge you to continue to speak out against the dreadful course which is being followed.

I have listened to and read the speeches made by Members of the Congress and administration as well as the many editorials printed in support of Johnson's policy in the press. I have also heard loudly condemned the "leftist beatnik" groups which oppose Johnson. What has amazed me is the lack of publicity or attention given to the responsible middle-of-the-road and conservative elements who oppose our present course of action in Vietnam.

My friends and associates are primarily conservative thinking Republican and Democratic businessmen of unimpeachable patriotism. Naturally the Vietnam crisis is discussed more and more each day—what would come as a great shock to President Johnson is the opinion that most of these persons have—they are dead set against what is being done.

I am not a Communist or a pacifist, but a person who sincerely believes in the American way. I fail to see, whatever arguments are used, how as an honest, peaceful Nation we can continue the terrible things we are doing in Vietnam.

You are by no means alone in your convictions. I am indeed grateful to you for taking the stand for our country's honor.

Sincerely,

CLEMENT R. KNORR.

MARINE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORY,
Woods Hole, Mass., July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though I am not one of your constituents, I would like to express my approval of your continued outspoken opposition to the adventure for us becoming more and more embroiled in Vietnam. Our moral stance is a pure shame. We have in fact abandoned all semblance of morality and the beginning to abandon all reason also.

This war will profit no one, except possibly China, and I hope you will continue to voice your opposition.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH WALD
Mrs. George Wald.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DISCOUNT CABINET CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., July 29, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE: I feel that we are going to enter into a terrible state of manufactured hysteria.

It seems the American people are being forced into a war that they don't need or want when a nation for an individual cannot decide on a right course it ultimately leads to disaster. The world is changing and people are made restless by these leaders who don't seem to lead but drift. We all know that after the killings and torture, the leaders will sit down once more and divide the world again. When nations rebel and refuse to be friendly with the power's who want to help them than something is wrong. It seems to me that the State De-

August 3, 1965

partment and the Pentagon seem to run this country. Why don't we hear from the Members of Congress who were elected by the people to run their affairs, instead of supposed experts.

My wife is now in a mental hospital from praying until she no longer could control herself. These are sad days for people of liberal feelings.

O' how long do we have to be deceived. All free men should stand up and shout. No more wars we are tired of killings.

Incidentally, I would have voted for you as president if you were a candidate.

I too am a maverick.

Respectfully,

DAVID DEAMOND.

SPRINGFIELD, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are indeed a gallant man. I admire your courage. Your stands against war are most admirable.

I, too, believe a victory in Vietnam would gain little. It would temporarily stymie future efforts by the Communists to take over these small second-rate countries.

Shouldn't our primary aim be to confront and contain the giant Communist nations? Why then did we not attempt to stop the takeover of China by the Communists, standing idly by assisting Chang to retreat to Formosa?

We tolerate the Russian rape of Poland, Hungary, and countless others, many being the same countries ravaged by Hitler, which drew the wrath of the free world and led to his eventual defeat. Why did we not then stand up and confront the Russians for these horrible incidents?

Our efforts in the little brush fire wars as Vietnam prove little. With our huge superiority of modern weapons in the air and sea, and practically unopposed in these mediums, makes us look the bully.

Being a pacifist I realize the futility of atomic war and believe everyone's efforts should be directed toward disarmament and the establishment of a strong United Nations to prevent abhorring systems as communism from accomplishing its aims to subjugate other covert nations.

Do you think the masses of people will ever wake up and refuse to be the tools of the power hungry leaders and their henchmen?

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES SIMS.

HAMDEN, CONN., July 29, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Once more, my thanks for your courageous comments on the new escalation of our Armed Forces in Vietnam.

I have just written President Johnson of my misgivings and urged upon him several suggestions to end the war.

We are heading toward a tragedy of enormous proportions unless the bulk of the American people speak up.

Sincerely, and gratefully yours,

Mrs. JOSE CASANOVA.

MIAMI, FLA., July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: Is it too late? Is there any way we can stop this before we have a huge land war with nuclear weapons?

I hope that many of your colleagues now regret that they did not openly oppose the war buildup as you and Senator GRUENING have. Are these men now scared into action? Is there any checkpoint you can see?

We feel there is nothing we can do. We have spoken of a petition and could easily collect signatures of people who oppose our Vietnam policy, if we thought this would do

any good. We hope you make a Senate speech soon and indicate what is a realistic approach. I would like to be on your mailing list.

I feel very thankful that you and Senator GRUENING have been so outspoken, that there are at least two Senators who are willing to bear witness against the crime we are committing.

MICHAEL LURIE.

BUFFALO, N.Y.
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep admiration of your courageous, persistent, and eloquent opposition to the administration's policy of waging an undeclared war against the people of a small, impoverished, and war-battered country.

There is no longer any doubt that the majority of the people of South Vietnam are opposed to the Saigon government. They are not Communists but are siding with the Vietcong. At the very least, they have no wish to fight the Vietcong. Their greatest wish is for the war to stop.

Thus the United States, the richest country in the world, is waging war—with the planes and bombs and increasing numbers of American soldiers—against the people of South and North Vietnam.

Although our intentions were honorable, we are now embarked on a course which is morally wrong and endangers the peace of the world. The world must be shocked.

We must stop. A peacekeeping mission must be brought in by some world agency, preferably the United Nations.

Sincerely,

MARION HYMAN,
Mrs. Marion Hyman.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
July 28, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Having just concluded a letter to the Vice President of the United States, reminding him of his past record up to the Vietnamese mess. I feel that I must commend you for your forthrightly courage in taking the stand so much in opposition to that of our devious administration.

I have a normal circle of friends and friendly acquaintances. They include Democrats, Republicans, Liberals, Conservatives, one or two leftists, and a few rightists. With the exception of the few rightists, I find among these friends and acquaintances, no approval of our Vietnamese adventure—in fact, for the most part there is downright disapproval.

The President is waging a war without the approval of Congress, as unconstitutional a procedure as any that has ever been attempted. Must we risk the destruction of humanity just to cover the errors and to save face for a stubborn, misled, egocentric man?

By continuing to speak out, as you have so far, you will earn the gratitude, not only of all Americans, but all of humanity.

Most respectfully yours,

GEORGE DREXLER.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: God bless you for your stand against this foolishness in Vietnam. It's not even foolishness, it is madness. I never thought I would be ashamed to be an American, but I am today. And to think that I, a conservative Republican, voted for Johnson to preserve peace because

of Goldwater's "fire and brimstone policy," is more than a bit of gall to drink.

Alas, alas.

Mrs. CONCETTA SAGERT.

P.S.—There are five registered voters in this family who are against this "mercenary army for hire" business we seem to be assigned.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.
July 28, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Morse code of decency and sanity doesn't fall upon a complete sea of deaf mutes—lost as most Americans seem to be in their refrigerators.

Yours is a clean, strong voice in a wilderness of fat and cynical toads. I wish, on odd blue Mondays, I myself were cynical toad enough to wish for the shallowly illiterate U.S. public—with its consensus support of the megamaniacal L.B.J. and his neo-Forestal, McNamara—the nuclear way it deserves.

Please keep talking—loud and clean and strong. A few of us are with you—plus hundreds of millions in Europe and Asia and (if you will excuse the expression) the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

JOHN BRIGHT.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking out so clearly this morning on the Vietnam crisis. I feel sorry for President Johnson for I know the pressures must be enormous, pulling him in different directions. So it is especially good to have a Senator of your stature reminding us all of the dangers the world faces if we continue in our present direction and the alternatives possible. I agree with you completely, and hope that the dismal affair will soon be turned over to the United Nations. If only we would do things because they are right, not expedient.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GLENN SMILEY.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am grateful to have at least one person in Washington who represents my point of view. I admire your courage in speaking for peace when everyone in Washington speaks for war. I hope you will continue to fight until the peace is won.

I would appreciate it if you would include me on your mailing list.

I hope my letter reaches you and not a computer or a scale because I want to wish you well.

Sincerely yours,

MILDRED M. TUTTLE.
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

HAZELHURST, WIS.,
July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sure I join with millions of Americans who hope you are wrong but are certain you are right.

I am getting old. In my time I have seen the last of the Hohenzollerns, the Romanoffs, the Hapsburgs, and the Bourbons as they walked the plank of lost or exhaustive wars and passed into history. Hitler and Tojo too joined them in my time. Likely we will not live to see the end of this war but one wonders what families are next.

Anyhow, I believe you are making a notable contribution not only to American

August 3, 1965

18447

civilization but also to world civilization and history.

It takes not only courage but conscience to choose the path you have chosen. It will be hard and lonely.

May the greatest power of all bless you and keep you safe.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL KRONENWETTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following your views on the situation in Vietnam. I cannot for the life of me see why Congress (the voice of the people) does not put a halt to L.B.J. and his group that is heading us toward total doom. The Bible tells us that he who taketh the sword shall perish by the sword and it looks like the United States is going to test this saying. These are our sons that are doing the fighting and dying. Johnson and his group will be safe in their bomb shelters. Please do something to stop him. I'm writing as a mother who loves her sons. I'll sacrifice them to defend their homeland but please not in some forsaken jungle. Let the people decide by vote whether they want war. They are the ones who will suffer.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HOWARD KLAUSS.

JULY 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you continue as an outspoken critic of President Johnson's unsound policy in Asia.

As a private citizen it is difficult to know how to effect public policy. If your office has any suggestions as to how myself or others who share my views can make a contribution toward the adoption of a rational approach to communism in Asia, I would appreciate hearing from you.

I hope you will consider running for the Presidency in 1968.

Sincerely,

MISS JOANNE DALBERG.

LARKSPUR, CALIF.

BATESLAND, S. DAK.,

July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have often appreciated your courageous devotion to truth, but never more than in your sharp reminders that the Pentagon program means accelerating the crisis in Vietnam, perhaps to the point of war.

This would be a war nobody wants and strategically foolish.

Is there anything we can do to enlighten the Nation to the fact that we will reap a harvest of devastation and war, if we keep sowing seeds of acceleration.

Sincerely yours,

FARLEY J. STURKY.

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: That there is one man in Washington who protests this horrible war in Vietnam lends one last ray of hope to our rapidly dying faith and confidence. After bloody Korea, how can anyone want to repeat it? There were over 160,000 American casualties there (Boston Herald) and it ended right where it started.

At the polls in November 1964, the people spoke loud and clear. Party did not count. There was only one issue. They voted for peace. They voted against a war in Vietnam. Do you believe that there is one parent, black, white, or yellow, who believes that Vietnam is worth his or her son's life? Washington turned a deaf ear to our pleas. The people apparently do not count any more.

The late Adlai Stevenson so aptly said: "The farmer wants higher prices; but he wants peace more. The businessman wants stability and the laborer wants security, of course; but they want peace more." The people want all of this but they want their sons most. And now, after nearly a quarter of a century, we see our sons still being yanked from home and college at the whim of Selective Service and sent to senseless slaughter in rice paddies of a people who does not want to fight. They are not free. They have no choice. At least the men in World War II believed in what they were fighting for but these helpless pawns do not have even that to sustain them.

Where are the Reserves? They are the volunteers. But of course, it is cheaper to send our boys. And so our boys die, cruelly and needlessly, before they are 26. And the seething volcano of parents' outrage and resentment grows and grows and grows.

As I overheard one little old lady from a backward country say the other day (she was here for a visit): "We got our sons. We got everything. You don't have your sons. You don't have nothing." She was so right.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARY OGDEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

July 26, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: The expected callup of Reserves is another escalation leading up to a fullscale ground war in southeast Asia that I feel will end in disaster for all concerned. Please continue your efforts to stop this path to destruction.

TOM SIEGEL & FAMILY.

WESTWOOD, MASS.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have followed with interest your critical reactions to recent administration decisions concerning activity in Vietnam. I want to say that I wholeheartedly support your position. We need, in the U.S. Senate, more voices like yours.

Even though I am from another State than the State you represent, I feel that I owe it to you to let you know that yours is not a voice crying in the wilderness.

I have studied Far Eastern philosophy, culture, religion and history. All I have learned leads me to the conclusion that what we are doing in Vietnam is dead wrong. To use violence to settle problems in a culture which in its several thousand years has not known the methodology of violence is a crime against humanity. I hope we eventually realize that a military solution will not work in a strong Buddhist culture.

Keep up your perceptive criticism for the benefit of those of us who agree with the stand you have taken.

Sincerely,

LEO F. JOHNSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

July 27, 1965.

To a Senator that is not afraid to talk over radio:

And how about the Far East trouble. It seems to me now that the United States has rockets that go 2,000 and 5,000 miles there is no need to have troops in the Far East.

The people in the Far East live different, and think different, so let them fight amongst themselves. We, the people, are supposed to be free and can vote for laws that has to do with the people here in the United States.

So why not call for a special national election, and let the people here in the United States vote on whether we should

stay in the Far East or to withdraw back to the international date line at the Pacific Ocean.

JOSEPH FRYER.

TYLER, TEX.,

July 28, 1965

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one who was born in your State, I feel obligated to tell you of my feelings on the present state of the Union.

I am morally opposed to President Johnson's further involvement in the Vietnam war. I am concerned about future involvement in view of his press conference today, and recent bombings of Russian-built missile bases.

I urge you to convince him that his present policy in Vietnam is not in the best public interests, or in the best national security interests of this Nation.

I will support you in your efforts to bring about a change in foreign policy, and I hope for the sake of the United States of America that you will be successful.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD E. YOUNG.

CHELAN, WASH.,

July 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Through the years I have come to respect your stand for the cause of peace and rationality. Now I write to you asking help. We are a typical young American family, with ordinary jobs, ordinary hopes and dreams and a lovely, extraordinary child whom we love, protect and hope for with all our hearts. Now we live in terror.

Each news bulletin of the increasing chaos in southeast Asia brings the sick chill of fear on us like a flood. We don't talk about it, because it only serves to make the peril more real, and we feel so helpless.

Marvin is one of those in the Army Reserve who will be called to active duty if the President and his advisors decide to do so; and it looks more likely every day. He will leave for Vietnam with the knowledge that he may never return. To some of our military leaders and perhaps to Mr. Johnson, he is expendable, a mere digit to be sacrificed in order to demonstrate our patience and resolve in suppressing the threat of communism.

Patience and resolve are all very noble, but this man is not expendable. He is far more than a digit. He is our light, our warmth, and joy and our strength. It would take more than patience and resolve to make our lives meaningful if he were gone.

Isn't it possible to demonstrate our Nation's purposefulness with equal strength at the conference table? Must this man and thousands like him be sacrificed on the altar of bravado? Can we strengthen ourselves by sending men to die? I only pray that you will use your influence to see that this does not happen, that you will urge that we strive to find a nobler peace than that of mutual destruction, to show the greater strength, of reason.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARVIN GRILLO.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

July 6, 1965.

Mr. CLIFFORD M. TURNER,
San Bernardino, Calif.

DEAR MR. TURNER: Thank you for sending to me a copy of the suicide note of Alice Herz.

I have not obtained a copy of the July-August issue of Fact, but I shall do so tomorrow and read it.

August 3, 1965

I am enclosing tear sheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing the latest major speech I have made in the Senate on the shocking U.S. war in Vietnam.

In your letter, you asked me for my views concerning your suggestion that steps should be taken to impeach President Johnson and perhaps some other officials. It is my view that such an impeachment attempt would be a very serious mistake. All it would do would be to divert attention away from the basic issues involved in American foreign policy in Asia and center attention on President Johnson, as an individual. It would cause many people who disagree with his foreign policy to rally behind him, because they would consider such a movement to be an ad hominem approach. Attacking Johnson, personally, will not change his course of action, and it will not win supporters for a change of foreign policy in Asia, but to the contrary, it will drive supporters away.

In my opinion, there is no question about Johnson's sincerity or his patriotism or his desire for peace. It is Johnson's bad judgment and mistaken reasoning in respect to the war in Asia that constitute the basis of the crucial problems that confront us in trying to get a change in Johnson's policies in Asia. To attack him, personally, by proposing impeachment would be the most serious personal attack that could be made upon him. It would rally the Nation behind him and result in his policies being escalated into a major war at a much faster rate. Those of us who oppose Johnson's foreign policies must meet his views on their merits. We should never attack him, personally.

Although you may disagree with me on this matter, I am giving you my honest advice in this letter.

I hope that the opponents of Johnson's policy in Vietnam will not fall apart by adopting what we call splinter tactics in conducting this struggle for peace in Asia.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Enclosure.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
June 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I copied the enclosed suicide note of Alice Herz from the July-August issue of Fact. I tried to type it just as it appears in an article "The Martyrdom of Alice Herz," by Hayes B. Jacobs beginning on page 11.

Jacobs' article extends from page 11 through page 17.

There was some publicity about the flaming death of Alice Herz in the San Bernardino Sun-Telegram. About as much as you got for your speech June 8 at Madison Square Garden. I have a copy of that speech.

I am not as brave as Mrs. Herz but I share her feeling. My own sentiment—dangerous to express—is that Johnson should be impeached. Some other top officials should go with him. Some such drastic attempt is necessary if the world is to be saved for mankind.

Our present actions are driving the Chinese Reds and the Russians back together. Do our great leaders think we can win a military victory over their combined forces? America and Russia in cooperation might save civilization; opposed to each other they will destroy it. We surely must have people in each country who realize this.

"Civilized men everywhere have common ideals and these ideals have a force that unites. They may prove more lasting than current conflicts." (U Thant, Reader's Digest, July 1962, p. 172.)

Civilized people in this country and the world over must somehow unite if the world as Mrs. Herz said is not to "blow itself up to oblivion."

Eventually I shall write to my own Congressmen and Senators regarding these things. But I don't know them as yet; and, little publicity as you have been given, I am sure I am substantially in agreement with you. I would be interested in all you have said concerning international matters.

I am beginning to ask myself more and more what distinguishes us from the Germany of 1939? And I quote here from your speech of June 8, "The Communists murder and kidnap and maim the villagers; we burn them with jelled gasoline. That is some record of fighting for freedom." We are driving Asians by the millions into the arms of communism. Or I might add, into some kind of totalitarianism.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. TURNER.

P.S. I am marking this letter personal because I want to be sure you read it as soon as possible. And the idea of removing Johnson and perhaps some others from office I should rather not at present share with your staff. It may be of some help to me if you can inform me how such a movement could be started. I recommend you read the article in Fact for July-August 1965. Alice Herz may well have been wrong in some of the things she said or did. But her suicide was not the act of an insane person but a brave, sincere, and humane one. I share her feelings—have since August 1945—but I have never been as courageous or energetic. I was frightened—terribly frightened—in August 1945—but I could not find people around me who shared that fright. I am no great prophet and no scientist. But I saw or thought I saw—the horrors that such a weapon as the then comparatively crude atomic bomb could bring humanity. It took no sage or seer to know that the thing could be "improved." Since that time, all my worst fears but one have been realized; we have not yet had a nuclear war.

We must have peace or nothing.

This subject is endless. I will leave it now.

P.P.S. I imagine there were many people like me—though certainly a small proportion—who were deeply agitated but were silent through sickness caused by ignorance and apathy—mostly by that which surrounded them rather than their own.

MARCH 1965.

To the Nations of the World, to U Thant,
Executive Secretary of the United Nations:

As a citizen of the world, in full possession of my physical, mental, and spiritual capabilities, before the Creator of this world I accuse Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, for having declared his decision—and already started to enact it; to use his amassed capacity of 400 times overkill to wipe out, if necessary whole countries of his choosing.

To the American people with the help of the colossal lie your Presidents Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, J. F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson, have deceived and misguided you. Through hatred and fear, deliberately whipped up during the last 20 years, you have allowed your lawmakers in Congress to appropriate endless billions of dollars for an arsenal of destruction—unlimited.

Awake and take action before it is too late.

Yours is the responsibility to decide if this world shall be a good place to live for all human beings, in dignity and peace, or if it should blow itself up to oblivion.

God is not mocked. To make myself heard I have chosen the flaming death of the Buddhists on the Wayne State University Campus of Detroit.

May America's youth take the lead toward life.

[Signed] ALICE HERZ.

MARLTON, N.J.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I sincerely regret that I am not one of your constituents. It seems impossible that you stand alone, a man of convictions who refuses to be swept along on a bandwagon. Even men of my own church, whom I know to be men desirous of peace, of world brotherhood, etc., have been found wanting (BARTLETT, of Alaska, CLARK, of Pennsylvania, HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and even the late Adlai Stevenson) and have allowed their own beliefs to be silenced in the interests of political unity. Without thoughtful opposition, no matter the cost, democracy cannot survive.

I hope you can raise up some little shadows, or infuse some moral stamina into our anemic doves, the war hawks have had far too much opportunity to bring chaos into our beautiful land.

Though I am not from Oregon, you continuously speak for me, and for others who reside far afield. Thank God for at least a single voice in the wilderness.

Sincerely,

BEATRICE SMOLENS.

EASTON, CONN.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Hold fast, hold fast Senator, and know well, that you have the backing of silent millions, who, tragically enough, keep their thoughts to themselves, and do not come out to be counted in these dire times of contemplated destruction.

It was James Russell Lowell who wrote:

"They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak.

They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth that needs must
think,

They are the slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three."

ABRAHAM YOUNG.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The "great manipulator" (with apologies to Abe Lincoln, the great emancipator) who may go down in history—if there is any future history—as the "great exterminator" has cleverly advanced us one fatal step further toward doom.

L.B.J. and his whole "Napoleonic complex" administration have brainwashed most of the American people but haven't of course fooled the rest of the world.

The grim farce must be stopped. We must negotiate with the Vietcong. More troops, more bombings of North Vietnam will produce nothing but further deterioration of the situation, aside from dragging us into a horrible conflict with China, and perhaps Russia.

And except for a handful of people like you, Congress abdicates its solemn duty—allows the President to wage, and escalate an undeclared war in violation of the Constitution.

I do not ordinarily believe in filibusters but I think that you and Senators GRUENING, CHURCH, McGOVERN, etc., must do this now or else—goodbye world.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY ROSENBLATT.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have seen you express your views many times on television, and many times I have wanted to write to you but

August 3, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18449

have resisted the impulse. But in view of the President's announcement today, I feel as if I must.

Sir, in a world of insane voices, yours is the only sane one I have heard express itself on the Vietnam situation. I only wish more people in high places had the insight and wisdom you have shown in connection with this terrible war. I am a young mother of 29, and I remember the Korean war which started when I was 14. I remember veterans of the Second World War saying that they would "mop it up" before the summer ended, but before it was over there was a shocking waste of young American lives and all for nothing.

This war is just a repetition of Korea. Nothing for the boys when they return home because there has been no formal declaration of war, so there will be no GI bill, no mustering out pay, no compensation for losing 3 or more years of one's life, not to mention possibly losing one's life, no adequate pension for the widows, the orphans, the lonely mother and very little thanks in general for all the suffering our boys are going through.

Every time I hear you speak, my heart lifts a little. You are a tiny light in this senseless horror and senseless waste of our best. If only you could make enough people listen. You are in a position to be heard; I am only one woman, a housewife and mother, in other words, a nonentity. Must we, in every generation, waste and spend our best in every useless war just to prove our point?

I have a 3-year-old son, just 3 today, and I read in the paper that this war could last 20 years. It's just insane enough to be true. I will not gladly send my bright, lovely boy to die in some God-forsaken mudflat for something that has begun before he was old enough to understand it all.

Sir, I have faith in you, both as a Senator, and as a man who calls them as he sees them. You are a plain spoken, honest man, and God knows there are pitifully few of them in Washington. You are speaking the truth, please make them listen, try and make them see what they are doing, how they are spending our best. When will we get more? These are men, not just machines to be wound up to die in Vietnam. That's not what they were born for, educated for, carefully nurtured for. If this is all that faces our male children, then we ought to kill them at birth and save the Government the trouble.

I realize that you are a busy man, and I won't take up any more of your time. But, in conclusion, I'd just like to say, I wish, and most sincerely, that you were one of the Senators from New York so that I could say that my vote helped send a sane man to the U.S. Senate.

God bless you in all your battles for the sanity of the American people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELLA WILLIAMS.

WASHINGTON, CONN.,

July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was terrified to hear of President Johnson's proposed fund towards the war in Vietnam, and to think of possible and probable results.

I always was opposed to the war in Vietnam, but now it seems that the United States is just asking for trouble, by trying to boost the war fund.

In my opinion, the only result that could come from this monstrous war fund is a third world war.

Although, as a citizen of the United States, I am powerless in this matter, I beg you to do all you can to veto this fund.

Sincerely,

ANNE EDITH MILLER.

SONORA, CALIF.,
July 24, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to congratulate you on your stand in the Vietnam affair. I think you are right on all you have said. What are we there for, and what will we get out of it except the loss of a lot of our boys and money. I was in the first one, the war to make the world safe for democracy, and the war to end wars. How did we come out? Keep up your good work.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR S. PAUL.

Kew GARDEN HILLS, N.Y.

July 28, 1965.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following your position on foreign policy and in particular on Vietnam. Your statements have been very logical, mature, and sensible. I wholly support your efforts to deescalate our involvement in that war and with you every bit of God's help in your efforts.

It sometimes becomes difficult for me to retain newspaper clippings of your statements. I would like to have as complete a file as possible, and ask you to send me any copies of your speeches you can.

If you do not have such copies, could you please let me know where I could obtain them. I would be glad to pay for them.

My best wishes for your continued health and activities.

Respectfully yours,

ANTHONY PETERS.

MT. VERNON, N.Y.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR MR. MOSS: I urge you to continue your lonely cry against this most dreadful act. Mr. Johnson has agreed to commit unwarranted destruction upon a country and ultimately, the world.

If you want to start a motion to impeach him I am with you.

Sincerely,

DR. B. BAUMAN.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Our most profound respect and admiration are with you for opposing the President's stand in Vietnam.

We know you are a singularly courageous and valiant voice of peace and truth in a world very much gone mad.

You have ardent supporters and admirers everywhere in this land. Would that we could stop this holocaust. We continue to write letters of protest to our President.

With deep gratitude and every good wish for your continued efforts toward peace.

Respectfully yours,

ELEANOR KLEIN,
KALMAN KLEIN,
RICHARD STANLEY,
HAZEL STANLEY,
SHIRLEY MARGOLIN,
LEO MARGOLIN,

and hundreds of others known to us.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you for keeping your voice raised in the Senate as a beacon of hope for the people of our beloved country and the world.

I have written to my own Senator, Senator CLARK, many, many times.

And as long as I can walk and talk I shall in my own small way do what I can with others or alone to help stop this holocaust.

The average person to whom I have talked—say, "this is all wrong but how do we get out."

The answer is simple yet difficult but possible and rational—stop the slaughter, get out—and give us the challenging opportunity to stop the bloodletting and begin to heal the wounds.

With the deepest of feelings,
Mrs. DOROTHY KUNKLE.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Re your statement of July 16, quoted in I. F. Stone's Weekly, July 26, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

"WAR FOR THE SAKE OF JOBS?"

"The other day a representative of a great union sat in my office protesting my position on the war in Vietnam. I listened patiently, very much interested in a point of view that is held by too many labor leaders in the United States today. During the conversation, he mentioned the great interest his union had in the helicopters, airplanes, munitions, and war materiel in Vietnam that was being manufactured by their labor. Senators know that I would be aghast. I was shocked to think that even the thought should go through his mind that any change in my position should be dictated by the alleged benefits to the economy of the United States by fighting a war in South Vietnam." (MORSE in the Senate, July 16.)

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Inasmuch as I serve the American labor movement in a professional capacity, I want you to know that I, too, am shocked by the position of the unnamed leader you cited in your statement. I believe that the loss of even one life in the war in Vietnam cannot possibly be offset by the alleged economic benefits of such a war to American workers. And I do not believe that American workers themselves would be so callous as to seek economic gains at the expense of lives of fellow human beings.

Sincerely,

COLIN D. NEAL,
Research Intern, Collective Bargaining
Section, Industrial Union Department,
AFL-CIO.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long admired your unswerving determination to speak out against our Government's war policies in Vietnam. Those of us in New York who have feared the steady escalation of the war for a great many months and regard the United Nations as one of the promising arenas for discussion truly value your persistent courage as you face the tremendous odds on the Senate floor each time you declare yourself on this subject.

I and my friends ask that you continue to demand that the United States honor its commitment to the Charter of the United Nations by permitting the dispute to go before the Security Council. We are very much behind you.

Sincerely yours,

JUDITH N. MITCHELL.

NATICK, MASS.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am deeply disturbed by the trend of events in Vietnam. Although

August 3, 1965

18450

there is great disagreement about what is the proper course of action, there is a large percentage of the American people which is convinced that the policy President Johnson is following will lead this country to military and moral disaster.

I urge you to speak out against the administration's policy. You will find much popular support behind you. The hostile tones of the reporters' questions at President Johnson's press conference of July 28, 1965, indicate to me that you will find a favorable press.

Sincerely,

ROBERT OLSHANSKY.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,

July 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your television comments on the Vietnam situation together with two other Democratic Congressmen was very informative. Your comments make sense and I sincerely hope that you will continue to take the position and stand that will give the American people an opportunity to express displeasure with the method used in our involvement. There are many American citizens who are deeply concerned about the reckless method of pursuing a policy that can only bring us disaster.

If sufficient Congressmen will follow your stand and proclaim their position for a complete discussion of all the facts, then perhaps we will not become involved to the extent that it's too late to change our course.

Sincerely,

ERNEST G. ROESSLER.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard a recent speech of yours in which you, once again, deplore the situation in Vietnam. It seems that you are one of the few voices of reason amid the turmoil, emotionalism, and head-strong aggression that appears to characterize the foreign policy of the present administration.

My husband and I, as well as many students here at the University of Buffalo hope that you will continue to use your influence to bring about a negotiated settlement and peace. We only wish there were more Senator Morses.

Most sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT BINCKERHOFF.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my gratitude to you for your consistent and outspoken criticism of administration policies in Vietnam on this latest and most drastic occasion as in the past. Although I am not one of your constituents, you have given far better expression to my views than any of the representatives from my locality, and it increasingly appears that you are the last sane man in Washington. Although this may not seem to be a good deal to be grateful for, I am nonetheless extremely grateful that you are there.

Sincerely,

SALLY ZANJANI.

BROWNSVILLE, TEX.,

July 28, 1965.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: While I am writing this to you on the stationery of the church of which I am the minister, yet let me make it crystal clear that I am speaking and writing for only myself as an individual.

With full attention and great interest did I listen to and watch you on TV this morning as you held your press conference. Again

you confounded the prognosticators as to what you would probably advocate and say. I was delighted with your appointments of Mr. John Chancellor as the new head of the Voice of America and Mr. Abe Fortas as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. May I say, also, that I think your appointment of Mr. Arthur Goldberg as our Nation's Ambassador to the United Nations was an excellent choice.

I am sure that the decisions you announced about the war in Vietnam, the calling up of more troops and the more than doubling of the draft quotas per month were reached only after hard, long, and painful thought. I can only commiserate with you.

While I am more than pleased that the number of troops to be called up for duty in Vietnam is smaller than the news media predicted, yet I am concerned, even distressed, about what is now our Nation's official policy, posture, and stance regarding the Vietnam situation. As I see it, it is a war policy, posture and stance rather than a policy, posture and stance of peace. This I deeply and sorrowfully regret. For, again, as I see it, the Vietcong will have no other alternative than to react in kind as well as the forces associated with that nation. Thus we, the Vietnamese and the Vietcong will be, I believe, enlarging a vicious and widening circle. To me, Mr. President, there is no such thing as a "just" war; war is always and inevitably destructive and noncreative.

It destroys persons, and persons regardless of their nationality, political allegiance, race, creed, educational attainments and economic status, are of supreme and unconditioned worth—the most precious thrust of all creation. War destroys cities, towns, villages and much valuable material. However limited the war may be, nobody wins, but everybody loses.

Because of these convictions may I be so bold and brash as to suggest what seems to me to be a possible creative way out of the present impasse: (1) that the U.N. be requested to establish a mediation commission consisting of representatives of the democracies, the Communist bloc, and the nonaligned nations in the U.N. Excluded from membership on the mediation commission should be any nation currently involved in the Vietnam war; (2) that a cease-fire or truce be effected for an indefinite period so as to allow ample time for the mediation commission to organize and do its work (3) that there be agreements among the nations currently involved in the war that they will abstain from any activity whatsoever that would tend to influence negatively the nation they regard as their enemy; (4) that the mediation commission work with all deliberate speed in attempting to work out a mutually satisfactory settlement of the disputes and issues between the nations now involved in warfare; and (5) that upon completion of the mediation commission's efforts its findings, proposals, recommendations and suggestions be announced before the General Assembly of the U.N. and given the widest possible publicity.

I am well aware that it is easy for one who is not an expert in international affairs to engage in typewriter desk quarterbacking. I am aware, also, that there are risks in this proposal—it may not work out. But it does seem to me to be worth a try in an effort to bring a permanent halt to this horrible and terrible carnage and to bring about a state of permanent peace—a just peace and a positive peace. And surely this proposal is in accord with the Charter of the United Nations; to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

Mr. President, I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to those named below. This may violate accepted protocol but when the world is threatened with a conflagration of immense proportions, I think protocol can be suspended.

Believe me, Mr. President, you have my prayerful thoughts as you discharge your difficult duties and responsibilities.

Very cordially yours,

ALBERT F. HARKINS.

DENVER, COLO.,

July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I have followed your congressional activities and efforts for 20 years and I might add with admiration. Why is President Johnson pursuing this Vietnam thing?

Can we win this fight short of an all-out atomic war? What kind of an exercise is President Johnson putting us through?

The only voice in the Senate that I have heard opposing this war has been yours. I would appreciate any information you might send. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

H. C. SUTTON.

MAPLEWOOD, N.J.,

July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We want you to know that we support your views on Vietnam, that is, for stopping the bombing, and negotiation with the National Liberation Front, as well as with North Vietnam.

We realize the difficulties but we must try. We have long hoped for China to be in the United Nations but now that seems remote. Having lived in the Far East, as well as in Europe, my husband and I understand the difficulties, but also the absolute necessity of avoiding world war III.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. B. ALLINSMITH.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my approval of your outspoken criticism of President Johnson's Vietnam policy.

I am a loyalist Democrat, but to me President Johnson is doing in Vietnam the very things feared Senator Goldwater would do. Keep up the good work and I wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely,

MAYMIE C. RUSSELL.

GLEN HEAD, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to tell you that I support your stand concerning Vietnam. You have given me at least a little hope.

Please continue to fight for peace in the world. You are one of the bright lights in a country which I am growing continuously more ashamed of.

Thank you for your great contribution.

JOHN M. MONDEO, Jr.

WILMINGTON, OHIO,

July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have tried so hard to stop that war in Vietnam and there are many of us that appreciate all you are doing.

I just can't understand the President, either, especially since he had promised no wider war last September when he told us, "We think that losing 190 lives in the period we've been out there is bad but it is not like 190,000 that we might lose if we escalated that war."

It looks as if that was nothing more than a campaign promise to be broken as soon as he was elected.

According to the papers he wants to go down as the great President. It looks more as if he wants to be the last President. I, for one, get tired listening to a lot of pious talk

August 3, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18451

while we are bombing those poor souls who have never harmed us in any way.

What they need is a better way of life and we could give it and have no fear of their going Communist.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HELEN GONA.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hats off to a real patriot. We in the 13th Congressional District in Brooklyn, N.Y., are behind you in your fight against our immoral intervention in Vietnam.

Please continue your work so that we will all be proud again to be called Americans.

GEORGE HOFFMAN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm with you. I think Congress should be required to go on record either for or against war in Vietnam. I frankly admit that I don't know what is best but I don't want any drawn-out land war on the mainland. Let's either destroy Red China now or get out. We must not take on both Russia and Red China.

JAMES D. BRYSON.

My DEAR SENATOR: May the Lord bless you to continue to speak up against this "stupid war." Our boys are being sent to their doom and will die like rats.

FRED KUPPERMAN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
July 26, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your valiant efforts for peace. You have shown courage where lesser men have weakened. Your efforts may be in vain, but at least you have a clear conscience.

Mrs. EVELY DAWSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 27, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My congratulations on your stand on settling the Vietnam crisis. It takes courage to speak out for your conviction. The American people are with you. What can we do to support you in stopping this mad war? I have written the President and have urged others to do so.

Please continue to fight for peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. AUDREY HURLEY.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We just sent this telegram to KUCHEL, BALDWIN, MURPHY: "Speech shocking—no formal declaration of war—U.S. action unconstitutional—immoral. "You share guilt.

"Voters."

Please keep up your work for peace and sanity.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE AND DALE ANDERSEN.

ITHACA, N.Y.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for courageously opposing President Johnson's policy in Vietnam. I wish you Godspeed in your efforts. I think you express the real thoughts of the American people; thoughts they would express far more vocally if not for the stigma of being labeled "unpatriotic."

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. SALTZMAN.

NORWICH UNIVERSITY,
Northfield, Vt., July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The newscast has just quoted you as taking violent exception to the President's noonday press conference.

I heartily endorse your position. I was of the opinion that only Congress could declare war, but there was the tacit admission by the President that our country is at war and the declaration of deeper and deeper involvement.

There should be a thorough congressional debate on our involvement in Vietnam. The U.S. Senate is said to be the most deliberative body in the world, but have they abdicated their responsibility? The President should not be permitted to commit the country through unilateral action. I felt that his position was perfidious, illogical and irresponsible. I trust that you will continue to speak up.

Most sincerely yours,

Rev. HERSCHEL G. MILLER,
Chairman of the Department of Religion and Philosophy.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had the privilege of sitting in the Senate gallery today to hear you deliver your courageous and vigorous speech on our suicidal adventures in Asia. As a teacher and a Fulbright grantee soon to leave to teach English for a year in Japan I feel especially keenly and close to the truth of your repeated and too often ignored warnings. Of course, when I had the temerity to applaud I was hustled from the gallery. I'm not sure but some of the other visitors would have liked to throw me out onto the floor. But even there, some faces registered agreement with you.

One other thing. I was sitting in the Orient Restaurant the other night when you and Mrs. Morse were also there having dinner. You look far too tired. All of us need you too much for you to look as weary as you did that evening. Please do your duty by the world only as far as you can maintain your personal health as well.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL A. EISENSTEIN.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Yours is the only sane voice I have heard in this wilderness of confusion.

Keep it up, sir. The American people are listening. As a Californian, I cannot vote for you, but I am with you, and I pray to God that you will continue to speak the truth as you have been doing.

F. McMULLEN.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,
August 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yours seems to be one of the few courageous voices of wisdom and moderation still raised in the Senate against the wrong and dangerous policies of President Johnson in Vietnam.

One can admire much that he has done domestically, but in the international situation he seems to have done all we feared Goldwater would do and to have led us down a path that can end only in the third world war which none of us want. Can you not rally your colleagues to oppose or restrain such a policy? We would be the first to say that the United Nations should handle this matter were another country engaged as we are in a foreign nation.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE ROACH.

St. JOHN'S UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST,
Powhatan Point, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Please keep up your witness against our present increasing involvement in Vietnam. Read your statements in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let's go to United Nations. Stop this madness. Help us.

BERNICE BUEHLER.

RYE, N.Y.,
July 30, 1965.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: While your speech was welcome in that it invited the United Nations to assist in trying to make peace, I believe that we will have to take more concrete steps before this hideous war can be ended. I think we should stop the aerial bombing and withdraw some of our troops to show that we are truly seeking peace. A 10 years war in the jungles is unthinkable, when we have commitments elsewhere in the world. You will have the whole Nation under arms.

Also, I think the question put to you at the press conference, about consulting with Congress, was very pertinent. Before any more money is spent or troops are sent, I think hearings should be held by Congress and expressions of opinion from all over the country sought. We all have much at stake in this and our representatives should be heard, as well as ourselves, and Congress can then decide.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. R. G. WEBBER.

AUGUST 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following telegram was sent to President Johnson today:

"As American mothers, we implore you to stop the undeclared war in Vietnam. You talk of peace, but you have devastated a country. Now our young men are to be sacrificed. You must halt this madness by withdrawing American troops."

Signed:

Mrs. Rose Kogan, 55 Calhoun Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mrs. Ida Hoffman, 14 North Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mrs. Hetty Applebaun, 33 Parcot Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mrs. Esther Bass, 461 Stratton Road, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mrs. Ofie Mayer, 1 Agar Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Mrs. Betty Reiser, 74 Hunter Avenue, New Rochelle, N.Y.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have sent the following message to President Lyndon B. Johnson, today:

"We wish to express horror at the American policy in Vietnam. We voted for you as a peace candidate and find you embarked on the road to a world holocaust. As American mothers, we urge you to stop this undeclared war."

Signed:

Mrs. RUTH ELTON,
Mrs. HANNAH GINSBERG,
Mrs. CAROLYN BLACKER,
Mrs. NAOMI UNGER,
Mrs. EVELYN LANDS,
Mrs. MARILYN KATZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 2, 1965.

SIR: The United States can use the U.N. to extricate itself from a losing war in Viet-

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8

18452

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 3, 1965

nam. Let the United States ask U Thant to make a statement that he is going to send U.N. representatives to Vietnam to hold a plebiscite. The plebiscite: Do you want to unite with North Vietnam? would be voted yes according to most observers. A yes vote is tantamount to the Vietnamese people asking us to go. The United States could then gracefully withdraw. And even if the vote is no, the United States has nothing to lose.

Very truly yours,
ALAN COOPER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On several occasions in the past I have disagreed with your ideas and policies. However, I now wish to congratulate you on your opinions you have voiced regarding our Vietnam policies.

You must continue to express these views. Only through influential people as you will we hope to impress the administration. There are many other people who share our views.

We simply cannot afford to escalate the war in Vietnam. The United States must be much more willing and desirous of initiating negotiations, and every possible effort must be made to urge the United Nations to start efforts in bringing about a settlement. As of now, we are only subjecting ourselves and millions of others in the world to world war III.

Our poor judgment in foreign policies should have long been corrected. We are now reaping the results. It is time we wake up and live in the 20th century, instead of 100 years ago.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. W. H. SLABAUGH.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
July 27, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I grieve for my country and the world. The "last, best hope of earth" cannot long survive on a diet of delusion. We will probably survive Vietnam, but this disastrous display of self-deceit portends a dismal future.

Democracy is by nature slow to adjust, it may be too slow to survive. Please hang in there and fight for the truth. You and the few cool heads in the Senate may be the last, only hope of earth.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. L. J. MARSHALL.

Copies to Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Senator FRANK CHURCH, Senator TED KENNEDY, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, President Lyndon Johnson.

ASTORIA, OREG., July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First, please let me congratulate you on your stand and voice about the policy in Vietnam. I think as you that we are wrong there now and all my World War II veteran friends think so too. We should quit militarily. Very interesting that Mark Hatfield thinks as you do on this and I'm very glad to have seen his vote at the Governors' conference.

Please recognize this also as the hearty hope of myself and my wife (me a doctor of the common people, she a career social worker) that you will vote nay on the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I'm sure you recognize that this would be a bad nonliberal thing.

Sincerely,

R. P. MOORE.

DIVISION OF PEACE AND WORLD ORDER,
GENERAL BOARD OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sure that you have noticed the article in the Friday, July 30, New York Times by Tom Wicker suggesting that the positions taken by Members of the Senate played an important role in moderating the decisions made by the President in regard to Vietnam.

While we appreciate fully the great difficulties confronting President Johnson in the very involving Vietnamese situation, we also believe that the restrained and thoughtful attitudes of many Members of the Senate have made a constructive contribution in the shaping of policy at this time. Certainly, any steps taken in regard to the war in Vietnam must be taken with full appreciation of their consequences and with every effort to achieve the declared goal of negotiations continuing at the same time.

This note will serve to express to you our appreciation for whatever role you may have played as the leaders of our Government faced very difficult problems and fateful choices during the past 2 weeks.

We earnestly hope that Members of the Senate will continue to advise with the President concerning their judgments of the situation, for in many ways they are closer to the concerns of the people of the Nation than policymakers often can be due to preoccupation with study and detail.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN WILL, Jr.,
Associate General Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 31, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I believe that your same courageous views on Vietnam reflect the true interests of the American people. I believe the United States has no more right to intervene in South Vietnam than the British had in the South during our Civil War.

Please keep fighting for an honest foreign policy.

Very truly yours,

SYDNEY G. BILDERN.

TRIBUNE,

Los Angeles, Calif., July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since you are one one of the few consistently principled men in Congress, I am appealing to you. The American people did not elect Lyndon Johnson to mount a war in Asia, or anywhere else. His was a mandate from the people to proceed in the opposite direction from Barry Goldwater. Today, he might as well be Barry Goldwater.

I call upon you, as conscientious public servant, to call for the impeachment of President Johnson. He is a vain, capricious and willful man, and his recent actions demonstrate the foolhardiness of electing a southerner. Militarism and deviousness have been inbred in them by hundreds of years of brutalizing and deceiving the Negro.

Mr. Johnson does not have the right to throw away lives while he holds out for a cease fire before negotiations. Americans have continued to fight when they have known that the peace had already been made and while they awaited the official word, in past wars, that is. Why stand on such a stupid piece of intransigence now?

You have taken drastic action before for a principle. You owe it to the thousands who will die futilely to do something now.

Sincerely yours,

ALEMENA LOMAX,
Editor-Publisher, Tribune.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my support of your stand on foreign policy in general, and especially on the Vietnam war. The American people in time will rally behind you and others who condemn the Johnson administration for its suicidal actions in the field of our policy in Vietnam and the whole gamut of giveaway American tax dollars for this or that reason.

We need more men like you to trumpet the policy of getting our nose out of everyone else's business. Send no arms and no aid. Let them solve their own problems. Our relations should be on a congenial trade basis.

Keep the pressure on Johnson.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD W. HARRIS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
May 29, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my heartfelt commendation and admiration for you in the courageous and forthright stand you have taken against President Johnson's foreign policy—especially that of Vietnam. In my opinion, most of our foreign policy is idiotic and self-defeating, and that in Vietnam is positively suicidal. If we are too stupid to learn from history, I suppose we deserve what we will eventually get.

I sincerely believe that what we are doing in southeast Asia is wicked. I cannot understand the double talk that comes from our President—"war is peace," etc., and the double think that goes on in our country.

You are a man of conviction and integrity. Would that every State had at least one like you. Long may you represent Oregon.

Sincerely,

NINA M. HARRIS.

JULY 30, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you so much for your stand against the war.

I thought that is what we put so much money into the U.N. for—to solve these problems. It makes me sick for all these men to have to go over there when there is so much to do and live for in this day of knowledge in every field.

It doesn't make sense to say we are going to fight poverty and then go ahead and make more.

I heard a reporter that was hurt and back here now. He said the people over there didn't care who won. He said they worked beside you in the daytime and at night would go out and sabotage the United States. Maybe some countries would appreciate what they are doing. But I have felt those people don't care.

I wish men like you could make others see how foolish this war is.

Yours truly,

Mrs. WALKER.

TACOMA, WASH.

TACOMA, WASH.,
July 29, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have never written a congressman before, but being an Oregon resident all my life until this month when I moved to Washington; I felt obliged to let you know my views on this Vietnam mess.

August 3, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18453

It seems to me you are right when you say we have become the aggressor nation. This is a position that I, as an American citizen do not enjoy being in.

It seems to me Congress is playing follow the leader with the President. I believe as I am sure millions of Americans do, that it is up to Congress to put a stop to this nonsense over there.

It was particularly heartening to hear Governor Hatfield come out against Johnson's policies. How long does the President think we can continue supporting the world and fighting everyone's battles? I hope others in Congress will have guts enough to object and stop this mess. Or are we slipping into a dictatorship too?

Yours truly,

GORDON D. PECK.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

August 1, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to thank you for your stand on Vietnam. You represent many of us who are otherwise unrepresented in present national politics on this tragic issue. It is difficult to understand how our Government can proceed so relentlessly on the road to international war when so much stands to be lost, so many stand to perish.

Would it be possible for your office to send me copies of your major addresses on Vietnamese situation? It would be greatly appreciated.

Again, thank you for speaking for me in this time of tragedy.

Sincerely,

JOEL R. HARRIS.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.,

July 31, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Millions of people all across our land appreciate your great courage in speaking out against the criminal war we are carrying on in Vietnam.

I have enclosed a copy of my letter to the President.

I hope you will read it.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ALBERTA DAUNELLS.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.,

July 31, 1965.

President L. B. JOHNSON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

Sir: Please be willing to accept the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam as a necessary party for negotiations in the war in Vietnam.

Let us use the U.N. to solve the difficult problem.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ALBERTA DAUNELLS.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,

August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We followed your advice and wrote letters to your colleagues and the President expressing our opposition to our increasing involvement in the fruitless war in Vietnam. Your courageous pioneering plus a considerable slice of more articulate public opinion combined with real pressures from friend and foe alike seem to have led to a more realistic evaluation of the actual factors involved. This in turn has made the outlook for an honorable solution to that terrible conflict somewhat brighter. We are thinking of the implementation, under United Nations supervision, of the terms of the Geneva agreement by all sides, and the subsequent undertaking of a southeast Asia development program which might give

those sorely tried peoples new hope for a better life.

The first order of business would seem a renewed suspension of aerial raids on North Vietnam in order to clear the atmosphere for meaningful negotiations.

Meanwhile let us express to you again our heartfelt gratitude for your courageous work on behalf of the most lofty of human objectives, peace.

Sincerely,

ERNEST AND MICHELE BUCHHOLZ.

EUGENE, OREG.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I oppose the war in Vietnam and will do anything I can to stop it. I am very proud of your courageous stand. But with the administration's recent affirmation of their old senseless policy, we have got to renew our efforts to thwart this path to oblivion. Please continue your dissent. The Governor's recent position has given me a glimmer of hope (but it is only a glimmer). I have written Congressman DUNCAN asking him to state his position in regards to Vietnam. I hope he supports us.

Yours very sincerely,

RICHARD REED.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

August 1, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Your voice is as that of one "crying in the wilderness." The peace forces of this country do feel encouraged, though, to have one person with the courage to speak out against what seems to us as a suicidal policy being followed by our President and his so-called expert.

I am enclosing my most recent letter (copy of) so that you may see how one citizen has tried to work for peace. Please feel free to use it as you see fit.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDIA PARNELL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

August 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Again and again, and yet again, I have written imploring you to use your influence to stop this senseless war in Vietnam. However, you seem only to listen to the experts (so-called), and they apparently advise to escalate this war.

You talk about our "commitments" and "keeping our word." Well, were there not promises to the voters to keep the peace? Let me remind you that we voted you into office, as we did Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Eisenhower before him, believing all of you to be men of peace. Now, we feel as if what we think means nothing to you, but that what you four or five "experts" think is all that counts.

If this Nation continues on its present policy, it will become, in my opinion, the most hated and distrusted among nations. And one might add, that instead of being known as a great and good president, you may be spoken of as one who "ruled" without regard to the voters' opinions, or the man who became a dictator.

It is a sad commentary on this Nation's behavior when the neutral nations feel impelled to attempt to bring about negotiations. Were I a Chinese or a Soviet citizen I would feel the same way about my nation.

Respectfully yours,

CLAUDIA PARNELL.

SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CALIF.,

July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In agreement with your evaluation of the Vietnam situation 100 percent.

As a life-long Democrat I supported Johnson wholeheartedly but now what am I and others supposed to do? We can't sit idly by and see destruction and slaughter brought on by our own party. That was "Goldwater's" theme. What has happened to our idealism in the Democratic Party? God preserve you.

Mrs. MARY SPARKNEHL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Almost every day I read or hear a statement by you on the Vietnamese war. And everyday I thank you. So for once I thought I would say, directly to you, thank you for your courage and integrity.

Sincerely,

CONSTANCE MILLER.

PALOS VERDES PENINSULA, CALIF.,

July 28, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my approval of your stand concerning the Vietnam situation and my admiration for your courage in speaking out on this apparently unpopular view.

Although I can see no good solution to the Vietnam situation at this late date. I feel the escalation of the war there is the worst of possible approaches to the problem. Basically, it seems that this is the common problem of an emerging, uneducated, unprepared people struggling with their many ambitions and also weaknesses. While I hate to see the people dominated by Red China. I feel that we have no real right to insist that Vietnam be dominated by the West. I am also aware that an independent Indochina was organized soon after the Japanese left only to be squelched by the French with American and British approval. In any case, I do not feel it is a cause worth having American boys (or any other boys, for that matter) killed for.

Again, let me express my appreciation for your courage and articulation on this matter.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. UNNEWEHR.

LITTLE NECK, N.Y.,

July 28, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write this letter to give you my support of your opposition to the war in Vietnam and to let you know that there are people all over the country that are also opposed to this ridiculous but impending tragic war.

Senator, you and Senator GRUENING are our representatives. I write to thank you for your courage in taking the dissenting stand and to assure you that those of us who are opposed to this war have full confidence in you—and that you will act with rationality and ethics, as you have in the past.

Sincerely yours,

VAMI E. FIANARD.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,

July 29, 1965.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have voted for you, Senator KUCHEL, Senator MURPHY, and Congressman TEAGUE because I believe you are good men. After years as a Republican, because of the hate groups, war-provoking groups, the senseless Communists-under-every-bed scare groups in the Republican Party, I changed to the Democratic Party, and now their actions are equally distressing.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, I believe, stands above most Americans today

August 3, 1965

because he has the knowledge of Asia, the integrity and courage to speak out for what is right. His speech of July 2 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is true. And being true, what reason has the present administration, and the passel of politicians who follow along, have in causing the increased killing of American men in Vietnam? What honest reason can be given?

Another fact: since 1927 when Mao Tse-tung came to power in China's communistic world, the U.S.S.R. (Stalin until his death) has used every means to destroy Mao. This condition still exists. These two powers will fight each other to the end. Anyone who has studied their history should know this. Surely the administration knows this. Yet, they are doing exactly what communistic Russia has planned, if we go to war with China.

If you and the administration cause the death of thousands of American men, as happened in Korea, to take Vietnam, we are face to face with 600 million or more Chinese who have good cause to hate us. Mao's maggot-type armies of millions have been warring for the past 40 years or more. It is a way of life with them. On their own soil they can go on fighting for another 40 years or more, slaughtering Americans and eventually driving them out. The situation is like a great diseased bed of quicksand.

In view of the foregoing facts, don't you believe that the administration's causing American men to die in Vietnam is nothing short of criminal? Without reason? The Vietnam article in Time magazine, July 9, gives facts of the complete degeneration of the Vietnam government and economy caused by the U.S. presence.

I thought Johnson would make a good president. His ability in domestic affairs has been good. But I have no faith in his actions regarding Vietnam. I wonder about the caliber of men surrounding him, their integrity and their motives.

Surely there must be other men of courage and integrity in Washington such as Senator MORSE, Senator GRUBENING, Senator YOUNG, Senator MANSFIELD, and Senator FULBRIGHT.

I do not know anything of your viewpoints on Vietnam. What course of action are you taking to bring peace? I most sincerely want to know. My son is one of a very fine group of officers going to Vietnam soon. If anything should happen to these men, the responsibility rests directly on your shoulders and on your conscience.

I would appreciate hearing from you.

Respectfully yours,

J. HOWARD CAMPBELL.

(Copies to Senator MORSE and President Johnson.)

LYONS, OREG.,
July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I take this opportunity to congratulate you for your courageous stand you are taking against and concerning the Vietnam war. I am very glad to hear also that Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, also is taking such a courageous stand against the Vietnam war in the Governors conference in Minneapolis, Minn., and in Washington, D.C. Thus I am very proud that two Representatives of the people of Oregon are taking this attitude against and concerning the war in Vietnam. I would only hope that more Congressmen would do the same and support you because you are fighting a lone battle against the forces that would take us into World War Three if it goes worse in this war. As I wrote you already before we will never win this war, the French have tried it for over 20 years and lost out and they knew that country and its people far better than the Americans do. Our boys over there are greenhorns

against the seasoned and well trained soldiers of jungle war. You cannot fight a war in the jungles with a modern Army and the Communists have unlimited manpower and get help from Russia as well as China. That war might well mean a catastrophe for our country. We did not have any business in the first place to start this war there; if we wanted to oust the Communists why did we not oust Fidel Castro from Cuba which is only 50 miles from our shore and clean up the mess in the Santo Domingo? This is an immediate danger to our country, but the Johnson administration and the State Department do not seem to be concerned about the Communists there. Congress should take more action concerning these danger spots close to our home. Hoping you will continue to fight against the undertakings in Vietnam, I shall remain, with kindest greetings and wishing you much success.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. G. MILLER.

MIDDLETON, WIS.,
August 2, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is not easy to write this letter, believing as I do that you feel sincere in your desire for peace in Vietnam. I have followed your statements to the press and understand your feeling that you are only doing what must be done. At the same time, however, I cannot help but feel sorely disappointed, that the man for whom I and millions of other Americans voted last November has now felt compelled to carry out essentially the same foreign policy that we then so resoundingly defeated.

I do not believe that our Nation's "honor" requires military victory in Vietnam, even if that were possible. What is being hurt is our Nation's pride—pride in our military power, and our ability to use it to make others do as we desire. This Nation has stamped on all of its money the words "In God We Trust"; perhaps "In Guns We Trust" would be more appropriate.

Mr. President, Christian morality compels us to end this conflict, even though our national pride may suffer as a result. Immoral means always lead to immoral results, and continued killing of the South Vietnamese people (whether guerrillas or non-combatants) can never contribute to a lasting peace, either for Vietnam or for the world.

Commendable as your call for negotiations and for United Nations participation are, I fear that what your more war-minded advisors have in mind is negotiations on our terms only. On the contrary, we must be prepared to take unilateral steps to end the war. Only in that way can we hope to achieve a settlement that is consistent with both the good of the people of Vietnam, and our own profession of commitment to Christian principles.

Yours truly,

ROGER D. SIMKIN.

Copy of telegram sent to President Johnson, August 2, 1965, on extension of the draft and military policies in Vietnam:

AUGUST 2, 1965.

To President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

Finding Americans increasingly shocked by drafting more men for Asian death and by saving military face through destruction. Constructive alternatives announce cease-fire for several weeks permitting Vietnam softening and pursue revival Geneva agreements. Commitment is to humanity in saving lives. May your hand be strengthened in this.

M. E. PIGEON.

(For many years Chief of Research Division, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of

Labor, under Mary Anderson; formerly for several years instructor at University of Virginia.)

(Copy to Senator MORSE.)

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Continued intervention through escalation as the civil war in South Vietnam is a futile policy. The one sure result is thousands of dead men, women, and children, Vietnamese and American. But certainly this is not our aim.

I plead for a policy of communicating with the National Liberation Front in genuine desire for a cease-fire at once, followed by negotiations.

Respectfully,

HILDA D. ARMIN.

(Copy to WAYNE MORSE.)

HARRISBURG, PA.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: Having read an editorial in the Harrisburg paper of your support for Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, I want to commend you for stating your opinion. It seems no one is allowed an opinion that doesn't follow the wishes of the power that is in.

Hoping for more men like you in Congress.

I remain sincerely yours,

P. VINCENT MYERS.

ROSEBURG, OREG.,
July 29, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: For what little it seems to be worth, you have my wholehearted support in your courageous stand against present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Many of my friends are with you also—and those who are not concede that there is no possibility of political "hay" in your stand.

In a way, it must be a lonely feeling—your forecasts proving correct, but your stature being such that "I told you so" is not a satisfaction available to you. When this is all over, and the appraisals are made (if there are any appraisers still functioning), my bet is that there are going to be many wishes that the "voice in the wilderness" had been heeded.

To me, the indications are that we are becoming a garrison state with a rubber-stamp attitude toward military demands, and a smug self-satisfaction in our international affairs. I am anxious to support any movement to reverse the trend.

Again, you have my deepest admiration and appreciation for your rational and selfless opposition to the course being pursued.

Sincerely,

R. D. SHERMAN.

ST. PETER CLAVER CATHOLIC CHURCH,
THE JOSEPHITE FATHERS,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: An inadequate word of commendation and gratitude for the stand that you have taken on foreign policy, and more particularly, on the Dominican Republic and South Vietnam. Among people who are attempting to preserve some fidelity to our heritage and Christian values, you have been a model and an inspiration. I have no doubt, that had it not been for your presence in the Senate, opposition to present foreign policy would be immeasurably weaker than it is. This contingency is hard to imagine, but undoubtedly, it is possible.

In my own feeble way, I have been on the line in this issue for many months now, and

August 3, 1965

18455

like yourself, have experienced the stupidity and malice of the superpatriots through the extensive measures at their disposal. So I have some idea what this has cost you. But I want you to know that I support you totally, and that scores of my friends do also, and that many of us are literally willing to face any eventuality to stop this fiasco and restore reason and Christian political values to the scene.

It may be possible for you, I do not know, to continue your efforts to have the Congress reevaluate our whole position in South Vietnam. And it may be possible too, for you to call upon the country for nonviolent protest against that policy. These two measures, it would seem, are the only check against the consensus which will logically lead to a large-scale land war in Asia, and World War III. Whatever you can do, I know that you will do. In this I have full confidence. My prayers and admiration go with you—to me, it is very clear that you are doing Christ's work. May He give you His wisdom and strength.

Gratefully in Him,

Rev. PHILIP F. BERRIGAN, S.S.J.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
August 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am writing to implore you to order a cease-fire in Vietnam. The slaughter of women, children, and other noncombatants is described daily in our newspapers, and the extent to which our country is willing to make war in that wretched country has been made abundantly, horribly clear. What is not clear is what we are willing to do to obtain peace, for to continue to kill people until their survivors accede to our demands can give us, at best, only a military victory, not peace. How we are hated everywhere.

Respectfully,

RUDOLF B. SCHMERL.

(Copy to Senator WAYNE MORSE.)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have mailed to President Johnson. It expresses my feelings on the situation in Vietnam.

I wish to thank you for your long and dauntless fight to bring some sanity into our policy concerning Vietnam. You and a few other daring souls in our Congress and Senate give one hope that the democratic system has some hope of survival. The President may be mad at you, but you keep from utter despair the many, many thousands who have been waiting for our elected representatives to speak out against this crazy, hopeless, immoral war. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to help you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOEL ISAACSON.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

President JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Certainly you will agree that saving the whole bodies of American young men and Vietnamese soldiers and civilians is more important than the saving of face. I am very pleased that you called in your most recent speech on Vietnam for the United Nations to try to seek a solution to the terrible disaster that is taking place there. However, I believe that we still seem to be too concerned with an honor that is dis-

associated from morality. We therefore lose our chance to gain true honor and glory, to show that we act on the principle that human life—the lives of citizens of other nations as well as those of our own—is more important than some abstract idea of national greatness.

I therefore call upon you to consider the following suggestions: (1) that we again institute a period of stopping our bombing of North Vietnam and of suspected Vietcong areas of South Vietnam. Indeed, I hope you would even consider the more extreme idea of calling for a cease-fire. Is it not worth it (so many lives would be spared) to try reason and good will before we resort to such horrific use of force, and (2) I would ask that you say not only that you would negotiate with all governments, but that you would be willing to see the national liberation front come to the conference table as a separate entity and not merely as a part of the North Vietnamese delegation. Would it not be to our advantage to have an NLF that might be able to show some independence from North Vietnam? I realize that our entire position is based on the assumption that Hanoi pulls the strings and that the NLF is not independent, but isn't it worthwhile exploring the possibility that there might be some independence in the relationship and that it would be a good thing for the country of Vietnam if we encouraged any independence? I believe that our foreign policy in general suffers from a blind spot in differentiating between different kinds of nationalisms, socialisms, and communisms. We should always make every effort to encourage independent nationalist movements when they may wish to not be beholden to some larger and more powerful Communist state.

We have not been able to help the people of South Vietnam to form a stable and democratic government. I believe they will be able to achieve one only if the war ends. Let us then make every effort—in deed as well as word—to help them establish peace in their land.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOEL ISAACSON.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
July 31, 1965.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am writing to protest the continued step-up of the war in Vietnam. I strongly believe that this war is neither pragmatically nor morally justifiable on either side.

I strongly support your recent, though belated, attempt to take the matter to the United Nations.

I urge you most sincerely to announce an immediate cease-fire for an indefinite period and to seek a political settlement with all involved parties (including the Vietcong if necessary).

Sincerely,

DOROTHY D. CIARLO.

PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a word to let you know how much we appreciate all the effort and determination you have shown toward bringing about a peaceful solution to the Vietnam situation.

Apparently we seem now finally to be moving in the direction which you have so ably advocated. Every American and peace-loving person in the world is indeed indebted to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH N. DEBLINGER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I view with horror the slaughter which is taking place on both sides in the war in Vietnam. Eventually a way will have to be found to end the bombings, to have a cease-fire, to have talks at the negotiating table.

I ask that you use your power and your high office to find new ways leading to an end to the war in Vietnam; to prevent a horrifying third world war which may lead to the complete destruction of civilization.

Sincerely,

GOLDIE SHAPIRO.

SPOKANE, WASH.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I agree that Congress should stay in session during this terrible situation in Vietnam. As you seem to be the only one that is using any commonsense of things, I am sending you some clippings. I don't think we should have to fight everyone's wars. Our boys have no future any more, and I think a great many of the ———? is caused by that. I am very much worried about things. I am a widow; have no children, but know a great many of the ones that are going to have to go.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. B. PECK.

NORTH BEND, OREG.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a disheartened, confused, disgruntled, upset, saddened, middle-aged American mother, surrendering one freedom after another, and much of my woman-gear income in the name of patriotic duty. Why?

Now I am faced with making the ultimate sacrifice—two fine, intelligent, hope-of-the-future, teenaged sons fast approaching draft status. Why? Where is the hope? Where is the future? What's the use?

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. J. WEYBRIGHT.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I trust you will present as strong a plea as possible to the Senate in support of your position for an end to the war in Vietnam. I am appalled at the constant increase of American troops and at the admission that they are no longer there as advisers, but as an actual fighting force.

Sincerely yours,

CELIA ZITRON.

LONG BEACH, N.Y.,
August 2, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep gratitude to you for your consistent opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam. What I don't understand is that your voice seems to go unheeded though your thoughts and reasoning seems so clear.

I believe that your constant prodding has finally led the administration to put the question before the United Nations, however.

Please continue your crusade against our involvement in an unnecessary war.

Respectfully,

Mrs. D. BERGER.

August 3, 1965

SOUTH NORWALK, CONN.,
August 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just to tell you I applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. I wrote President Johnson today urging him to make you Secretary of State.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH LASKER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed message was telegraphed to the President on August 1, 1965.

I thank you beyond the power of words for all your words, votes, speeches and stand for peace, truth, justice, and honest government.

Respectfully,

GWENDOLYN WILLIAMS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

MR. PRESIDENT: I implore you to exert your full power to stop the war in Vietnam and use the United Nations for peaceful negotiations.

GWENDOLYN WILLIAMS.

CAMP HILL, GA.,
August 1, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Undoubtedly you receive many letters in regards to your stand in Vietnam. Personally I admire your position. This war is really a planned effort on the part of a few people.

You have given many speeches on this subject. I would like to have copies of them. As I recall you related the steps we have taken to be in the position we are in at present.

It is most unfortunate President Johnson is incapable of turning his ear to the military. He seemingly deserves to be generous to the old and now generous in giving lives to a cause that has no value. In my opinion he has fooled our entire Nation. He appears to be mad for publicity and does desire to be a so-called war President.

Would you mail me copies of your speeches and by all means keep the torch burning for peace.

M. E. ACKERMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The following is a copy of a telegram I have just sent to President Johnson as a public opinion message:

"Oppose undeclared war in Vietnam. Withdraw American troops. Honor Geneva Convention agreement."

Very truly yours,

Mrs. AMELIA K. LIPPIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 29, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are in full agreement with your outspokenness with regards to Vietnam. Please continue to speak for us. I have written to President Johnson and would like to help you any way I can. Today Mr. Johnson likened the situation to World Wars I and II. We fought to protect freedom then, now we protect General Ky, who reportedly said his hero is Hitler. I would like to hear from you.

JAMES F. McILROY.

EGG HARBOR CITY, N.J.,
August 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If only all your supporters would write to you. It seems as though so many people feel as you do about

the Vietnam situation but feel it useless to do anything about it.

God bless you on your courageous stand in this terrible situation. I feel like a lot more Senators and Congressmen feel as you do but find it easier and more comfortable to go along as "a nation of sheep."

A concerned citizen,

Mrs. COLETTE GALLI.

YPSILANTI, MICH.,
August 2, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our eternal thanks go to you for your intelligent, humane, and courageous stand on Vietnam. I am enclosing two editorials by Jud Arnett who sums up the situation very well.

Sincerely,

GLADYS SWEET,
ARDON SWEET.

[From the Detroit, (Mich.) Free Press,
July, 1965]

ANOTHER WRONG WAR

(By Judd Arnett)

TODAY AND YESTERDAY

What did Lyndon Johnson mean Wednesday when he said of the fighting in South Vietnam—"It is really war"? In a hundred newspaper offices across the land the editorial writers are probably weighing the first use of those words by the President in describing our participation in that unhappy affair. In due course there will undoubtedly be a hundred interpretations.

To me, the words brought back memories of another man and another crisis. I remembered the poignancy of Franklin D. Roosevelt's farewell to a group of well-wishers at Warm Springs, Ga. "I will see you next year," he told his friends, "unless there is a war."

"What did he mean?" a hundred editorial writers then asked in a hundred different ways, but it was some months before the true significance of the President's goodbye was commonly grasped. Then it was realized that F.D.R. had, indeed, been trying to tell us something.

Was the later President, caught in the web of still another international catastrophe, trying to tell us something at his rather strange and curious press conference of July 28? Quite possibly. As well as he could under the circumstances, he may have been intimating that we have reached the point of no return with the Red Chinese. The war in Asia every American military leader of this century has dreaded may become a reality unless the last dove of peace can somehow penetrate the air cover raised by the hawks. What a tragic circumstance. How did it come about?

A good deal of our share of the responsibility has stemmed from the American obsession with communism, bordering at times on hysteria. Off and on since 1919 we have been witchhunting in this country, at times paying homage to nitwits who had no other credentials beyond the ability to shrill—"There goes a Communist!"

The result has been a gradual creation of a mass inner-instinct to look up on every Communist, real or fancied, regardless of his location, as a mortal enemy, to be eradicated by any means. That communism, particularly when it followed on the heels of czarism or some other form of tyranny, might be a first step toward freedom has not occurred to many of us. We have crusaded instead for instant democracy, little realizing that it has small chance in this world under existing circumstances.

This obsession has led us into faraway places, in the role of the policeman, where we had no hope of success. Vietnam was such a place, but we went there, and stayed there, because of the assurance that we were "fighting communism." Bosh. To this day

the average citizen of that hellhole, north or south, does not know the difference between Marxism and the Bill of Rights. Nor could he care less. What he wants, in essence, is what Douglas MacArthur once said all Asians were seeking: a roof over his head, clothes on his back, food in his belly, and the chance to express a bit of nationalism. He would appreciate help from all sides, then would the foreigners kindly go home, please?

For years in this country the atmosphere has been such that if a decent citizen carried a sign in a parade, advocating peace, he was immediately classified as some kind of a nut. We have even made fun of the Quakers, the gentlest people with whom our society has been endowed.

A Quaker, mind you, saying that there might be something to brotherly love if only we pursued it, has been an object of scorn. That obsession, again; that inner-instinct; that inner-fear; that disregard for the evolution of political ideas; that reluctance to provide a trouble world with moral and spiritual leadership; that substitute for warmth and compassion—dollar diplomacy.

Well, here we are. At least, here we are if I interpret the President's remarks with any degree of accuracy. Another wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time.

Sure we will fight it; "My country, right or wrong"; certainly we shall win it. But isn't it about time more of us asked: Was this war necessary—and how do we avert the next one?

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press,
July 1965]

BEHIND THE MASK

(By Judd Arnett)

Persistent visitors to this outpost may recall that a sense of uneasiness has been weighing upon the sentry who mans it.

The night has been dark; there have been rustling noises out beyond the barbed wire; in the distance a dog has howled; to the corporal of the guard the sentry has said—"There is something wrong with America."

But what? Until now, there have been no proper words for it. Just mumblings of things half seen and whispers half heard. Oh, for the power of communication; oh, to be able to draw a word picture for the corporal of the guard.

So thank heaven for Seymour Melman, who has put the gist of my uneasiness into disturbing sentences. They appeared in the July 31 edition of Saturday Review in an article entitled "Behind the Mask of Success." They were but a preview, we are told, of what he has written in a book—"Our Depleted Society."

Dr. Melman is a professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University and he has looked at America through the eyes of a man appalled at the erosion occurring in our productive capacity. He states what he has seen in this fashion:

"A process of technical, industrial and human deterioration has been set in motion within American society. The competence of the industrial system is being eroded at its base. Entire industries are falling into technical disrepair, and there is massive loss of productive employment because of the inability to hold even domestic markets against foreign competition.

"Such depletion in economic life produces wide-ranging human deterioration at home. The wealthiest Nation on earth has been unable to rally the resources necessary to raise one-fifth of its own people from poverty.

"The same basic depletion operates as an unseen hand restricting America's relations with the rest of the world, limiting foreign-policy moves primarily to military-based initiatives."

What has caused this erosion? High wages? Pleasure seeking? A breakdown in

August 3, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18457

public morals? Widespread unrest because of the civil rights revolution? No, no—none of these.

"The deterioration," Dr. Melman writes, "is the result of an unprecedented concentration of America's technical talent and fresh capital on military production. * * * Military extravagance has been undermining the world value of the dollar and with it the world banking position of the United States."

What is wrong, you may be asking, with a Nation that in 1964 produced goods with a total value of more than \$600 billion? Did any of our enemies approach this outpouring, or any of our friends? Again, no; we were in a class by ourselves. But statistics can be deceiving. To get at the truth you have to rephrase the question, How much of our production, our growth, was healthy, and how much was parasitic?

Too much was parasitic. Bad enough was the fact that \$50 billion of the Federal budget went into the arms and space races, which expended manpower and materials without contributing to the Nation's economic health or to future production. But even worse was the siphoning-off of the technicians and scientists so sorely needed in industry.

Very few American companies, Dr. Melman notes, are now undertaking extensive research programs. For every 100,000 Americans, there are 11 fewer physicians in practice than in 1950. We were short 118,000 schoolteachers at the start of the 1964 autumn term. Only 9 percent of our foreign trade is carried in American ships—because our shipyards have been oriented primarily to serving the Navy. And this, if you please: "Americans must begin to face the bitter fact that, in many areas of industrial technology, the United States has already become second-rate."

Our emphasis, and much too much of our brainpower, has been devoted to overkill. Today, we can deliver the equivalent of 6 tons of TNT for every person on this planet. In overkill, things are booming, you might say. But this is progress?

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We understand you are taking steps that might call a halt to Vietnam and its impending holocaust. I and all I have talked to are against any involvement there and for a complete reversal of our steps and thorough withdrawal from that area. Our naval control of the seas is enough. We appreciate your attitude and know it's that of an overwhelming majority of our people. Let's get out for good and all. Our potency will supply the grace for such a step.

Respectfully,

MARCUS CHADWICK.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 1, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have just written to President Johnson regarding his action in Vietnam.

America is looking to you to open up the discussion. Believe me, the people are very fearful and worried.

We are counting on you.

Gratefully yours,

TOBEY SCHEIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 31, 1965.

President JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write to express my concern over the crisis in Vietnam. I think that

the increased war is a mistake. We must use our ingenuity to arrange a cease-fire. The reputation of our country is being severely damaged by our military action. Let us call for a continuation of the Geneva Conference, or turn the entire matter over to a United Nations decision.

Sincerely,

HERBERT E. ANDERSON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully support your position for letting the Vietnamese settle their differences by a return to the 1954 Geneva Treaty Agreement.

We must honor that agreement and stop the slaughter of innocent Vietnamese women, children, and patriotic citizens. Our soldiers should be home.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM ZITRON.

ACCOKEEK, MD.,
July 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MR. SENATOR: Three cheers for a man with courage enough to shout down the United States latest political endeavor.

I am against the Vietnam fray and glad to see at least one Senator is also. There is no justification to sending Americans to their death in a country which doesn't want us, will throw us out if "we" win (win what?), and imprison all Americans if we lose. I can hardly believe that once again our country is in such a worthless mess.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARILYN WITHERS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 31, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is a tragic mistake for us to be involved in fighting an ever-extending war in Vietnam. Our present position in Vietnam brings us more fear among our allies and more enemies than any Communist regime could hope to do.

The United States must join with the United Nations in bringing about negotiations for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. It is imperative that the Vietminh, as well as all other parties involved in the war, be brought to the negotiating table. This is the only way in which a real solution could be achieved. The Vietnamese people must be allowed to determine their own political and economic organization and must be guaranteed by the United Nations from intervention by China, the U.S.S.R., the United States, or any other country.

The war in Vietnam cannot be won by us with guns, bombs, fire, the torture of Vietnamese guerrillas, or by the destruction of the face of Vietnam. On the other hand, your idea of calling for international aid in developing the Mekong River Delta is far-sighted and humanitarian. Such a development would go down in history as one of the great achievements of mankind and your name would become one of the bright stars in the memories of all peoples.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. PATRICIA M. CAMPBELL.

VALPARAISO, IND.,
July 30, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is an article I read from a Catholic magazine. I knew you would like to read. Please hang this clipping on a bulletin board, so all of your col-

leagues can read, and see the blunders being made in Washington, for which the people of this country must suffer for in the not-too-distant future. I go along on your way of thinking, we have nothing to gain in Vietnam only to kill our young, innocent men and have a large debt to pay. We know France is still suffering from the ravage of her war in Vietnam.

Senator MORSE please help us not to make the same mistake. We need more Senators like you, so please keep up the good work. From an American citizen.

Mrs. M. MAHRINGER.

P.S.—What good is the U.N. if our differences cannot be straightened out in a peaceful way, or are we just the suckers that pay the bills?

[From the Sunday Visitor]

RIGHT OR WRONG—AMBASSADOR LODGE RETURNS
(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Two years ago our commander in South Vietnam, General Harkins, declared that the war was almost won. Secretary of Defense McNamara told us that most of our troops would be home by Christmas. Sir Robert Thompson, who was head of the British Advisory Mission to South Vietnam, notified his superiors at Whitehall that the Vietnamese Government "had turned the corner and was winning the country back from the Communists." Our distinguished career Ambassador, Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., agreed wholeheartedly with these reports and continued backing the Diem regime.

President Diem was so successful that the Communists were determined to get rid of him. It was their only chance to avoid defeat. In order to get him out, the Communist concentrated on a propaganda campaign against him. They soon convinced reporters that the Government was persecuting the Buddhists. Ambassador Nolting said that in 2½ years he had not seen any signs of religious persecution, but the correspondents kept reporting that there was. Their proof was the fact that several Buddhists committed suicide. A suicide actually does not prove anything, but pictures of two or three suicides in Saigon electrified the world. They even made a great impression on the White House.

Averell Harriman had been urging President Kennedy to appoint Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador to South Vietnam, and when Lodge walked into the President's Office in June 1963, the President exclaimed: "Just look at this. Where is it all going to end?" He showed Lodge a newspaper photo of a Buddhist committing suicide. Kennedy told Lodge that the people in Vietnam were against President Diem and our policy there was liable to fail. He urged Lodge to go to Saigon and take over.

THE FIRST MISTAKE

The biggest single mistake about Lodge was for the administration to send him there in the first place. He did not have any experience in Asia, or as an Ambassador to any country. Both former President Eisenhower and former Vice President Nixon advised Lodge not to take the appointment. But he did, and he arrived in Saigon in August 1963, only to commit blunder after blunder. His first mistake was to present himself publicly to the leaders of the Buddhists before he called on the President of the country. Less than 24 hours after he arrived, he wired Washington that Diem would have to go. His next blunder was to grant asylum to the Buddhist monk, Thich Tri Quang, who had been trained by the Communists, and whose three brothers were Communists. Tri Quang had been giving the Government a great deal of trouble, and Lodge gave him sanctuary in the Embassy for 10 weeks, until Diem was assassinated, even though it was against our regulations. Tri Quang's pagoda was the headquarters for the Communist Youth Or-

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190001-8

August 3, 1965

ganization. Father Raymond de Jaegher has since testified that Tri Quang was a Communist all along.

The Communists had gained control of only 14 of the 3,500 Buddhist pagodas in South Vietnam, but the 14 got all the attention from the press, with their cries of persecution. The Communists also spread the rumor among American officials in Saigon that Diem was trying to make a Catholic state out of the country, and that the 500,000 Protestant in South Vietnam were going to be persecuted.

Ambassador Lodge told President Diem that he said send his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, away. Lodge gave no real reasons for this, and Diem pointed out that it was like asking President Kennedy to get rid of his brother, the Attorney General. Shortly before his death, Counselor Nhu declared that at first they thought Lodge, being a Republican, "would possess good anti-Communist feelings, but he did not. His political views seemed to be dominated by Linus Pauling in the New York Times, and the neutralist preaching of Walter Lippmann. * * * Lodge never stopped working against us. His only care has been to intrigue against the legal government to which he was accredited."

THE BIGGEST MISTAKE

When President Diem requested Lodge to send four Americans away for plotting against Diem, Lodge failed to do so. Lodge told Diem he should replace his ministers, who were civilians, with army generals. He even had the generals polled to see if they would lead a coup. None of them wanted to, but as Marguerite Higgins wrote: "Everyone in Vietnam knew that America had declared political war on Diem."

Secretary of State Rusk had praised President Diem highly just a few months before we instigated his death. So had Vice President Lyndon Johnson, and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Secretary of Defense McNamara described the magnificent work done by Diem as "a near miracle." The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, a few weeks before Diem's death, declared: "In the 8 years since Diem took power, Vietnam has acquired full independence, written a constitution, and held the first four national elections based on universal suffrage ever conducted in Vietnam."

To refute the Communist charges that Diem was persecuting the Buddhists, Diem had asked the United Nations to send a factfinding mission to investigate. The report was due to come out that fall, but after Diem was killed the United Nations did its best to suppress it. It was finally uncovered by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, and published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. It completely cleared the late President from charges of persecution.

South Vietnam had enjoyed nearly 10 years of stable rule under President Diem, and both American and British officials had declared that the war was being won. When the Communists in Vietnam heard about Diem's death, they exclaimed that it was "too good to be true." Of the 8,000 strategic hamlets that President Diem had built to protect the peasants from the Vietcong, 5,000 were taken over by the Communists after his death. The war was prolonged several years by the death of Diem, a death brought on by the policy of American officials. Somehow, through a merciful providence, it is hoped that this time Ambassador Lodge will not impede the defeat of communism, but expedite it. In either case, his appointment remains a mystery.

TOWACO, N.J.,
July 30, 1965.

HON. WAYNE B. MORSE,

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: Please continue to urge as boldly as you always have negotiations on the Asian war. We hope the Presi-

dent doesn't get the idea he has a mandate on that issue—we are so happy when we see that you have "spoken up."

Sincerely,

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 1, 1965.

GOV. MARK HATFIELD,
State House,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATFIELD: Thank you for your courageous stand at the Governors' conference and later at the Presidential briefing. Your interview by Reporter A. Robert Smith, the Oregonian, July 30, deserved most thoughtful bipartisan reading and consideration. Viewpoint was obscured by misleading headlines.

I am grateful that you joined Governor Romney in calling for action by the United States in accordance with (1) our own Constitution and (2) that of the United Nations. This is indeed a crisis which threatens not only the peace but the very existence of all people.

Oregonians may well be proud that a leader in each party is willing to speak out and voice scruples which constituents feel but are hesitant to express.

Very sincerely yours,

MISS ALICE B. PLYMPTON.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 2, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just written to President Johnson, to protest the escalation of the war in Vietnam, and to implore him to do everything in his power to bring about a peaceful settlement.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE G. HOKE.

DARIEN, CONN.,
August 2, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I endorse what the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam has to say in the newspaper ad, New York Times, August 1.

Indeed, I go further than the committee does and say that I believe we should withdraw from Vietnam forthwith.

Mr. President, you have said our "national honor" is at stake and that we can't withdraw now. With all due respect, may I say that leaders in all wars and on all sides have said that—all have believed they were right and that God was on their side. This thinking has caused countless millions to die and countless millions to be orphaned. We can no longer think in this way if we wish civilization to survive.

If the Communists act dishonorably that is no moral defense for our acting so. Unless I am completely wrong about the facts of the Geneva agreement and our promises in connection therewith, I do not feel that we acted altogether with honor there.

So, I believe we should leave Vietnam now, and I say this being fully aware of our commitment. A much larger thing is at stake than this. Besides I have a hunch the great mass of the people in South Vietnam would be very glad to see us go. Present withdrawal would take great courage, perhaps too much, for the political wolves would surely be at you. But I think the world would salute you.

Aside from the moral question involved, I believe our present policy in Vietnam is unsound. We might succeed in killing and maiming an awful lot of Asians but our policy would fail. You can't create anti-Communists by killing people—you only

create more Communists, or some other distasteful breed of 'ists.

Mr. President, I voted for you and I admire you for what you have done in several important directions. It is not the purpose of this letter to carp, but only to express a simple deep-seated conviction.

Respectfully,

CONGER F. SHUR.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader without losing my right to the floor.

CREATION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 512, S. 945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 945) creating a Joint Commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the word "with", to strike out "a similar" and insert "an equal"; on page 3, line 18, after the word "navigability", to insert "Notice in advance of Commission hearings, including a statement of the time and place of the hearing, shall be published in the Federal Register and may be published elsewhere as the Commission deems appropriate."; on page 4, line 10, after the word "by", to strike out "statutory, common law, and judicial authorities on the subject of navigability of waters" and insert "the law and usages recognized and applied in the Federal courts"; in line 15, after the word "shall", to insert "be published in the Federal Register and shall"; in line 17, after the word "all", to insert "executive"; and in line 24, after the word "in", to strike out "the United States District Court for the District of Alaska within one year after the publication of such determination in the Federal Register. Such judicial review shall be on the basis of the record" and insert "the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. As a part of its answer the Commission shall file a certified copy of the transcript of the record, including the evidence upon which the findings and decision complained of are based. The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commission, and may, in its discretion, remand the cause for a rehearing. The findings of the Commission as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive."; so as to make the bill read:

11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended by adding after subsection (j) the following subsection:

"(k) To delegate, by published order or rule and subject to the Administrative Procedure Act, any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more hearing examiners, members or employees of the Board, or Federal Reserve banks. The assignment of responsibility for the performance of any function that the Board determines to delegate shall be a function of the Chairman. The Board shall, upon the vote of one member, review action taken at a delegated level within such time and in such manner as the Board shall by rule prescribe."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 533), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1556 would authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more hearing examiners, members, or employees of the Board, or Federal Reserve banks.

The Chairman of the Board would be authorized to assign responsibility for the performance of functions delegated by the Board. Any one member of the Board might under the bill require the Board to review actions taken under the delegation.

S. 1556 would give the Federal Reserve Board the same powers of delegation which have been granted to most independent boards and commissions. Such authority is possessed, for example, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The situation with which the Board of Governors is presently faced because of its lack of specific authority to delegate any of its functions is described in the following excerpt from a message sent to Congress by President Kennedy on April 13, 1961:

"The reduction of existing delays in our regulatory agencies requires the elimination of needless work at their top levels. Because so many of them were established in a day of a less complex economy, many matters that could and should in large measure be resolved at a lower level required decision by the agency members themselves. Even where, by the force of circumstances, many of these matters are now actually determined at a lower level they still must bear the imprimatur of the agency members. Consequently, unnecessary and unimportant details occupy far too much of the time and energy of agency members, and prevent full and expeditious consideration of the most important issues."

Under the bill the Board could not delegate its rulemaking functions or those pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies.

The Board pointed out that in recent years its responsibilities have increased tremendously, both in the field of monetary and credit policies and in the field of bank supervision and regulation. For example, the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the Bank Merger Act of 1960, and the Securities Acts Amendments of 1964 have imposed substantial additional regulatory responsibilities on the Board of Governors.

The Board gave the following examples of kinds of actions which it might delegate if the bill were enacted—though no decision to do so has yet been made: extensions of time for filing reports by affiliates of State member banks; extensions of time for registration by bank holding companies; extensions of time for registration of securities of State member banks; waivers of the 6-month notice that a State member bank must give before withdrawing from membership; approvals of investments by State member banks in bank premises in excess of their capital stock; approvals of the declaration of dividends by State member banks under certain circumstances, and approvals of the purchase of certain stocks by foreign banking corporations.

It is expected that the enactment of this bill, by relieving the Board of unnecessary detail, would enable it to act more effectively and more expeditiously on the major functions which would not be delegated. It would be appropriate for the Board to indicate in future annual reports the extent to which this authority to delegate is exercised and the benefits resulting from such delegations.

ENABLING FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS TO INVEST IN CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The bill (S. 1557) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to enable Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (e) of section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 358) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) To establish accounts with other Federal Reserve banks for exchange purposes and, with the consent or upon the order and direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and under regulations to be prescribed by said board, to open and maintain accounts in foreign countries, appoint correspondents, and establish agencies in such countries wheresoever it may be deemed best for the purpose of purchasing, selling, and collecting bills of exchange, and to buy and sell, with or without its endorsement, through such correspondents or agencies, bills of exchange (or acceptances) arising out of actual commercial transactions which have not more than ninety days to run, exclusive of days of grace, and which bear the signature of two or more responsible parties, and to buy and sell any securities which are direct obligations of, or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by, any foreign government or monetary authority, and which have maturities from date of purchase not exceeding twelve months and are denominated payable in any convertible currency; and, with the consent of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to open and maintain banking accounts for such foreign correspondents or agencies, or foreign banks or bankers, or for foreign states as defined in section 25(b) of this Act."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report, No. 534, explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1557 would authorize Federal Reserve banks to invest in securities which are direct obligations of or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by any foreign government or monetary authority and which have maturities from date of purchase not exceeding 12 months and are denominated payable in any convertible currency. This authority could be exercised with the consent or under the order and direction of the Federal Reserve Board.

From time to time the Federal Reserve banks have had occasion to engage in foreign currency operations designed to safeguard the value of the dollar in international exchange markets. These operations have been implemented by swap arrangements between the New York Federal Reserve Bank and foreign central banks under which the New York Federal Reserve Bank acquires foreign currencies.

Under the present law amounts held by a Federal Reserve bank in an account with a foreign bank may be invested in bills of exchange and acceptances that arise out of actual commercial transactions and have maturities of not more than 90 days, or they may be placed in an interest-bearing time account with the same or some other foreign bank. However, this has not always been practicable. Under present law, such funds may not be invested in obligations of foreign governments, such as foreign treasury bills, which are more readily available under present conditions. S. 1557 would permit this.

This proposal was recommended by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and was supported by the Treasury Department.

LOANS TO EXECUTIVE OFFICERS BY MEMBER BANKS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The bill (S. 1558) to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (g) of section 22 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 375a) is amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) No executive officer of any member bank shall borrow from or otherwise become indebted to any member bank of which he is an executive officer, and no member bank shall make any loan or extend credit in any other manner to any of its own executive officers: *Provided*, That any member bank may extend credit, on terms not more favorable than those extended to other borrowers, to any executive officer thereof, and such officer may become indebted thereto, in an amount not exceeding \$5,000, or, in the case of a first mortgage loan on a home owned and occupied or to be owned and occupied by such officer, in an amount not exceeding \$30,000, but any such indebtedness shall be promptly reported by such officer to the board of directors of the bank of which he is an officer. If any executive officer of any member bank borrows from or if he or she or become indebted to any other bank or banks in an aggregate amount exceeding that which he could lawfully borrow from the member bank of which he is an executive officer under this section, he shall make a written report to the board of directors of such member bank, stating the date and amount of such loan or loans or indebtedness, the se-

August 3, 1965

curity therefor, and the purpose for which the proceeds have been or are to be used."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 535), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1558 would amend the provision of the Federal Reserve Act which now prohibits any member bank from lending more than \$2,500 to one of its executive officers. It would authorize member bank loans to their executive officers up to \$5,000, or in the case of a first mortgage loan on the officer's home, up to \$30,000. Such loans could only be made on terms not more favorable than those extended to other borrowers, and they would of course, be subject to the usual rules applicable to personal or mortgage loans. These loans would have to be reported to the board of directors of the bank. In addition, if an executive officer of a member bank borrowed from other banks in an amount in excess of what he could borrow from his own bank, he would have to make a report to his board of directors.

The provision now in the Federal Reserve Act was enacted in 1933. It has become unrealistically serve in the light of changed economic conditions. The President's Committee on Financial Institutions recommended in 1963 that the \$2,500 ceiling be increased.

S. 1558 was proposed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and its enactment was recommended by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Treasury Department advised the committee that it had no objection to the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for his usual courtesy and graciousness.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Montana is most kind.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that I may yield, on the same basis, to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He deserves much credit for his patience. He has waited a long time.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] delivered a superlative speech on reapportionment. To appreciate that speech, one must read it in context with the speech the Senator from Michigan delivered last year, in which he set forth what had happened year after weary year because of malapportioned legislatures in Michigan, in which one house, organized on the basis of area, was opposed to the other house, which was organized on the basis of population.

Today, the senior Senator from Michigan pointed out how brilliantly the 1965 Michigan Legislature had performed on a one-man, one-vote basis. He said that even the Republican press of Michigan had warmly praised the performance of that legislature and had described it as a virtuoso performance.

The Senator from Michigan listed bill after bill that had passed this year, that the legislature had not been able to pass in previous years. This was under the unusually adverse circumstances of the first Democratic legislature in many years and a Republican Governor.

Mr. President, this is an example of how the one-man, one-vote method will operate. It will give a new lease of life to State legislatures to act for themselves and not have to depend on the Federal Government.

LEJ'S JULY 28TH SPEECH ADVANCES REFUTATION OF SENATOR MORSE ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in his strong attack on the policies of the administration and on the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin, left the impression, in my judgment, that the President has not been working hard for peace. The President's activities on behalf of peace are well known throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that the brilliant and remarkable statement delivered by the President last Wednesday, July 28, which constitutes an excellent rebuttal of this afternoon's remarks by the Senator from Oregon, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM CONFLICT

The text of President Johnson's formal statement at his White House news conference yesterday follows:

My fellow Americans:

Not long ago I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote: "My dear Mr. President, in my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam. I have a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served in World War II. Our country was at war, but now this time it's something I don't understand. Why?"

I have tried to answer that question a dozen times and more. I have discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, and in San Francisco in June. Let me now discuss it again. Why must young Americans—born into a land exultant with hope and golden with promise—toll and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place.

The answer, like war itself, is not easy. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century. Three times in my lifetime—in two world wars and in Korea—Americans have gone to far lands to fight. We have learned—at a terrible and brutal cost—that retreat does not bring safety, or weakness peace.

DIFFERENT KIND OF WAR

It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam at

times with understandable grievances have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war.

It is guided by North Vietnam and it is spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the south, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic domination of communism.

And there are great stakes in the balance.

Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves, resist the growing might and grasping ambition of Asian communism. Our power is a vital shield. If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise or protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there was no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

PROMISES ARE NOTED

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years, have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We just cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

What are our goals in this war-stained land?

First, we intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms.

They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have increased their fighting forces and their attacks.

I have asked the commanding general—General Westmoreland—what he needs to meet mounting aggression. He has told me. And we will meet his needs.

I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division, and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested. This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft call from 17,000 over a period of time to 35,000 per month, and for us to step up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

NO CALL TO RESERVES

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded that it is not essential to order Reserve units into service now. If that necessity should later be indicated, I will give the matter most careful consideration and I will give the country an adequate notice before taking such action, but only after full preparations.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam lately the steps that we will take to substantially increase their own effort, both on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages. Ambassador Lodge is now formulating a new program to be tested upon his return to that area.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to the Congress to review with these committees, the appropriate congressional committees, what we plan to do in these areas. I have asked them to be able to answer the questions of any Members of Congress.

Secretary McNamara, in addition, will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of this new cost until a supplemental measure is ready, and hearings can be held when the Congress assembles in January.

In the meantime, we will use the authority contained in the present defense appropriation bill under consideration to transfer funds in addition to the additional money that we will ask.

These steps, like our other actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement.

READY FOR CONFERENCES

We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can perceive, nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power, but we will not surrender and we will not retreat, for behind our American pledge lies the determination and resources, I believe, of all the American Nation.

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable.

We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table. I have stated publicly, and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time. Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions with the help of 40 nations throughout the world, but there has been no answer.

But we are going to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposal. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield.

WELCOMES ASSISTANCE

In this pursuit, we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations. If the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

I made a similar request at San Francisco a few weeks ago, because we do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory, but we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the south, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision and that they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have now cruelly shattered. If the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes still guide our actions. As battle rages, we

will continue as best we can to help the good people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their lives, to feed the hungry and to tend the sick, and teach the young, and shelter the homeless, and help the farmer to increase crops, and the worker to find a job.

It is an ancient but still terrible irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are really united in the simple elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

WOULD HELP ALL ASIA

As I said at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, I hope that one day we can help all the people of Asia toward that desire. Eugene Black has made great progress since my appearance in Baltimore in that direction—not as the price of peace, for we are ready always to bear more painful cost, but rather as a part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

Let me also add now a personal note. I do not find it easy to send the flower of our youth, our finest young men, into battle. I have spoken to you today of the divisions and the forces and the battalions and the units. But I know all of them, every one. I have seen them in a thousand streets, of a hundred towns, of every State in this Union—working and laughing and building, and filled with hope and life. I think I know too how their mothers weep and their families sorrow. This is the most agonizing and most painful duty of your President.

There is something else, too. When I was young, poverty was so common we didn't know it had a name. An education was something you had to fight for. Water was really life itself. I have now been in public life 35 years, more than three decades, and in each of those 35 years I have seen good men, and wise leaders, struggle to bring the blessings to the land of our people. Now, I am the President.

It is now my opportunity to help every child get an education, to help every Negro and every American citizen have an equal opportunity, to have every family get a decent home and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, that is what I have lived for. That is what I have wanted all my life since I was a little boy, and I do not want to see all those hopes and all those dreams of so many people for so many years now drowned in the wasteful ravishes of cruel wars.

I am going to do all I can to see that never happens. But I also know, as a realistic public servant, that as long as there are men who hate and destroy, we must have the courage to resist or we will see it all, all that we have built, all that we hope to build, all our dreams of freedom—all—will be swept away in the flood of conquest.

So, too, this shall not happen. We will stand in Vietnam.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6 in 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, despite, or perhaps because of, the torrent of words provoked by Senate Joint Resolution 2, I suspect that the ordinary citizen still does not realize that what is at stake in this debate is his, and every man's, right to have an equal voice with his neigh-

bor—and with his country cousin—in his State government.

In words every schoolboy learns, Abraham Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg of "government of the people, by the people and for the people." He did not distinguish between people on the basis of where they lived, or their color, or their religion, or their economic position.

In his concern, he was reiterating the belief of the Founding Fathers who were virtually unanimous in advocating representation on the basis of population.

Thomas Jefferson once said:

Equal representation is so fundamental a principle in a true republic that no prejudice can justify its violation because the prejudices themselves cannot be justified.

Yet the blunt truth is that this is exactly what we are being asked to do. We are being asked to give constitutional standing to a particular prejudice—a prejudice against people who live in urban and suburban areas in favor of people who live in rural areas.

It is significant, I believe, that even before the Federal Union was formed, the Northwest Ordinance passed by the Congress under the Articles of Confederation provided that there be one representative for a specified number of inhabitants. Of the 20 States joining the Union after ratification of the Constitution and before the Civil War, all but 2 made population the basis for legislative representation in both Houses.

If history is not as strong a reed as supporters of this amendment claim, the realities of the 20th century are even less encouraging. Any believer in our Federal system must be concerned by the steady erosion of the role of the States in this century. This amendment will not halt that erosion. On the contrary, should it be adopted, it would worsen it. For the erosion is in large part caused by the inability or the reluctance of malapportioned State legislatures to deal effectively with the problems of great numbers of their citizens.

"You can't expect a city man to worry about the farmers," one of the amendment's leading proponents recently said. To which an opponent of the amendment replied, "or vice versa."

The vice versa can be documented at great length. But to argue the relative considerations shown by farmers to city men, or by city men to farmers, is to beg the question. It assumes that all farmers think alike and that all urbanites and suburbanites think differently. And, from our own experience, we know this is not so. For example, only 2 years ago wheat farmers divided almost evenly in rejecting the wheat program developed by the Department of Agriculture.

And the same differences in view are characteristic of the suburban and urban dweller. For farmers and city men and suburbanites are more than just that. They may be young or old, rich or poor, producers as well as consumers, parents or bachelors, union members or business executives, wise or stupid, regardless of where they live. Geographic location may have an influence, but it is only one of many factors affecting a given individual.

The Dirksen amendment further assumes virtue is inherent in geographic areas with the fewest people in them.

This, I suggest, is an appeal to romanticism, if not to downright snobbery. People are not better or worse because of where they live. Neither virtue nor wisdom knows a right or wrong "side of the tracks." Is there anything less brutal about the calculated murder of the civil rights workers in Philadelphia, Miss., than about the senseless killing of a passerby on a New York street? Both are abhorrent to the conscience of decent men everywhere.

It is inherent in our American system that there is no fixed, unchanged minority or majority. Both will vary with the issue. Vital to the effective functioning of our system is the principle to which Jefferson referred; that is, the belief that no minority should have a veto power over the majority. Yet, in State after State, a minority has effectively throttled the majority through the disproportionate representation of the people in the legislature.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The practical effect of this amendment would be to enable a particular minority which now enjoys the power of veto to perpetuate its power.

The issue was well put in the statement of the Young Men's Business Club of Birmingham, Ala., to the House Judiciary Committee:

The fact is, and history proves it, as a legislature becomes malapportioned through the passage of time it simply ceases to speak for the people on this subject. It begins to speak for its members as officeholders—and officeholders rarely vote to remove themselves from office.

The suggestion that factors other than population be permitted to be taken into account in apportionment if approved by the vote of the people is a deceptive proposal considered in a practical light. It sounds as if the people can have population apportionment if they want it, but can permit deviations if approved by majority vote. But, of course, the entrenched legislator in a grossly malapportioned legislature can never really be expected to give them that choice voluntarily. The people can only expect a chance to accept or reject discriminatory proposals submitted to them by the legislature. If the people are offered an improvement, the choice becomes, accept this or take the worse situation you have now. Under the proposals here, we can assure you that equal representation of people will never even be proposed for adoption in Alabama.

I recognize that the amendment now provides for submission initially, to the voters of a State, of two plans for reapportionment, one of which must be based on population. But what protection is this to the disenfranchised Negro citizens of Mississippi or Alabama? In this connection, I call attention to the fact that while the amendment would provide for periodic submission thereafter of reapportionment to the people, only one plan of reapportionment need be submitted on the later submissions and it need not be based on population.

Although the proponents support this amendment as a protection to minority rights, one of their chief arguments for passage is the right of the majority to establish a system of unequal representa-

tion in which one citizen's vote counts for less than another.

I cannot agree. I do not think a majority of the voters have the right to take away a constitutional right from even one citizen, and that is the basic issue involved in this amendment.

If this is a simplistic position, so be it. I am a simple man.

Most of my colleagues would agree, I believe, if we were talking about the rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, jury trial, and the like. Most would agree if we were talking about reversing the principle enunciated in the historic decision on school desegregation. Would this position be regarded by anybody as a simplistic position?

In the last few years we have acted to enforce the right of Negroes and others to education on an equal basis with whites.

Would this position be regarded as a simplistic position?

I point out, as has been suggested on the floor of the Senate with respect to the question of apportionment in the Reynolds against Sims and other cases, that like that case, the school desegregation decision involved the overturning of court doctrines which had been settled and accepted by the courts generally, as well as by the Supreme Court and by the people of the country for a long time. The precedents before the action in that case were actually followed by the court in the representation case. This action affords just as much—and I think none at all—justification for action to amend the Constitution, as does the action of the court in the representation case.

In other words, I believe that we cannot say that some rights of a citizen are alienable and some are inalienable. All are equally sacred rights. I place no right higher than the right to an equal choice in one's government.

Only a few weeks ago, we acted to uphold the right of individual citizens to vote regardless not only of their color or race but regardless, too, of the wishes of perhaps a majority of the voters in their States—at least, certainly the majority of those now effectively exercising the franchise in their States.

It is ironic that even before that measure was law we should be asked to nullify it, at least in part. Moreover, we are being urged to act not in response to any great upwelling of public opinion that I can see, but at the behest of those who now enjoy the status quo and, not unnaturally, are unreceptive to change.

I have not detected any great swell of public demand for the Dirksen amendment or for any of the variations which have been suggested. So far as detecting any feeling about it on the part of the public at large is concerned there has been a feeling that the one-man, one-vote principle is perhaps long overdue.

What a weird perversion of minority rights we confront. Why give a man who lives on a hundred acres a greater voice than the man who lives on a 100-foot lot or a 50-foot lot, or a 15-foot lot, as is the case with some of the people

in Washington. Is there any more justification for this than there would be for giving more than one vote to a Jewish citizen, or a Catholic citizen or a Unitarian? Do we really believe that while all men are equal; some are more equal than others?

Do we really believe that, while all men are equal, some are more equal than others? In any case, as I have already said, I do not believe the majority of the people want unequal representation. I suspect the history of reapportionment in New Jersey is not unlike that in many other States. For years, efforts to revise our New Jersey State constitution were unsuccessful because of the reluctance of the legislature to open the door to possible reapportionment. The price which we paid to secure a constitutional convention in 1947 was to exclude the question of apportionment from the purview of the delegate to the constitutional convention. There was no way the citizens of New Jersey could vote for a constitutional convention without accepting this limitation imposed by the legislature.

It was on the ballot in that form. The question was: "Shall there be a constitutional convention that shall not have the power to change the representative of the counties or the geographic limitations of the counties?" Of course, the people said they wanted that convention, because they wanted a convention to deal with other pressing needs that our people long felt should be met. The price of that was to accept the limitation imposed by the legislature. There was not any way the people of New Jersey could have a constitutional convention without accepting the limitation imposed by the legislature.

Yet when the question of reapportionment was recently raised in the courts of our State, some members of the State legislature argued that by voting for the constitutional convention, the voters had "approved" the existing apportionment. Our New Jersey Supreme Court rightly rejected this specious claim. Our federal system can function effectively only if the States function effectively. The story of many of our State legislatures has been one of stall and stalemate, indecision, and inaction in the face of urgent and pressing issues, issues affecting millions of our people in the great urban areas of our government. These issues can only be met, and will only be met, by governments truly representative of and responsible to all the people.

Therefore, I am opposing this amendment. I shall oppose it even though it is amended to take some of the peripheral objections, some of them very sound objections, to the amendment as originally proposed.

Some of the Members of the Senate are proposing further amendments, but I suggest that while these amendments are desirable, and they represent an improvement, there is no amendment which, so far as I can see now, would make this constitutional amendment anything but offensive to those who believe the right of an individual citizen under the Constitution ought not to be taken away by a majority of the people

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18571

House Concurrent Resolution 457 is designed to spur action by a regional commission on what may well be one of the few remaining approaches which holds any promise of enlarging the usable water supply in the New York-Philadelphia area. Since such an approach is only possible now through a regional, multi-state authority such as the Delaware River Basin Commission, I want to acknowledge the importance of the concept and practice of regional water regulation in this present drought crisis.

However, the present philosophy of regional water control is inadequate to the challenge which we face today and will surely face again. Only 3 weeks ago the House and Senate passed the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. This measure, involving the expenditure of at least \$120 million over the next 10 years by river basin commissions, will set the direction of our water resource planning for the coming decade. Yet there is little comfort in this law for most people living in the Maine-Washington-Cincinnati triangle now suffering acute drought conditions. The reason, as I pointed out on July 13 at page 16001 of the RECORD, lies in a provision added to the bill for the first time in conference. The provision, section 3(d) of the act, expressly forbids the Federal Water Resource Council or any river basin commission acting under the law to "study, plan, or recommend" the transfer of waters between areas under the jurisdiction of more than one commission.

This limitation was apparently tailored to the demands of Columbia River Basin residents who feared the act would lead to diversion of Columbia River water to the Southwest. The actual effect of the provision is, however, far broader, and its impact on other areas dramatically illustrates the total inadequacy of basin-by-basin water resource control as the governing premise of our national water policy.

New York City's present plans for coping with its acute water shortage is a clear case in point. New York City has extensive water recovery and storage facilities on the upper Delaware. These have proved insufficient to meet simultaneously the requirements of both New York City and Philadelphia. Consequently, New York City plans to reconstruct a water intake project on the Hudson River which it once started and foolishly abandoned. This intake, unlike Philadelphia's intake on the Delaware, is located near the conduits carrying water from the Delaware reservoirs to New York City. This will permit New York to either use Hudson River waters as an emergency substitute for Delaware withdrawals or mix waters from the two sources for the city's water supply.

Mr. Speaker, the river basin planning concept of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 stands foursquare against this proposed project. None of the \$15 million in Federal and matching funds which the Delaware River Basin Commission might receive in the next decade could be used to support or perfect it, if a Hudson River Basin Commission comes into being as it surely will, in response

to the availability of \$15 million under the act.

Instead of addressing itself to the effect of this prohibition on the Northeast, the brief Senate debate on the Water Resource Planning Act conference report centered on a just-released Presidential directive to the Water Resources Council, calling for a report within 7 days on the Northeast water crisis with recommendations for Federal measures to alleviate it.

This report, which was transmitted to the President on July 21, must be a shock as well as a disappointment to many of those in the Northeast. The shock is due to the Council's commendable candor in concluding that the water emergency will become increasingly serious during the next year, possibly resulting in outright disaster conditions in several States. The disappointment stems from the inadequacy of the Council's recommendations for Federal action in view of its own findings. The recommendations are numerous, but mainly focus on technical assistance or credit extension to State and local governments, special relief for the farm economy, and ominous contingency plans for mobilization of civil defense agencies as well as the Office of Emergency Planning.

Nowhere does the Council's report indicate that it considered its mandate in section 102 of the act to "maintain a constant study of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of water and related land resource policies." Instead the Council prefaces its recommendations with the statement, "The paramount responsibility for providing local water supplies traditionally and properly rests with local jurisdictions."

Mr. Speaker, to say the least, it is ironic to assert flatly, in the course of a report foretelling disaster, that the traditional way is the proper one. I would go farther and say that one obvious reason for the present crisis is the very lack of coordination of our basic water policies which the council declined to consider. While we accept national coordination in the development of our electric power system, we still harbor the anachronistic view that our water resource management should reflect virtually every theory of water use control ever conceived by the mind of man. In keeping with this we honor the law of capture or prescription on the one hand, and virtual socialization on the other. There is a special water commission in one State, while in another claimants must press their case in ill-suited and crowded courts. We exalt the geological integrity of the river basin and at the same time construct reservoirs and conduits which establish the preeminence of demographic considerations.

In short, our water economy is not so much mixed as it is scrambled. The absence of nationally applicable standards and the failure to coordinate water pollution control with water use regulations has resulted in chronic misallocation of this vital resource throughout the country. Now the water problem which lies under the surface everywhere is painfully exposed in that area of the country

which has been most inclined to take water for granted and least receptive to the changes which must come sooner or later. Within the next year, while the water shortage continues, there is an opportunity to make these changes.

Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a measure entitled the Federal Water Commission Act, based in large part on the Model Water Use Act adopted in 1958 by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. The act would cover all water use or water-polluting activity affecting any navigable, interstate, or coastal water in the United States.

Taking or pollution of these waters would be governed by uniform Federal standards aimed at insuring that they are employed only for beneficial uses. A five man Federal Water Commission, modeled after the Federal Power Commission, would administer and enforce the law.

The key provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to require and issue permits for all uses of water resources covered by the bill, including any activity which results in water pollution. The Federal permit procedure specifically protects existing uses so long as they remain beneficial and serve the public interest. Householders taking water directly from wells or streams for normal domestic use are exempted from the permit procedure.

Permits issued by the Commission would continue in effect for a minimum period of 5 years. This provision, although working to the disadvantage of a regional, State, or local government which quickly corrected the shortcomings in its own laws, would remove the market-depressing element of uncertainty which would otherwise affect sales of water-related assets. Further, the bill provides scrupulous procedural safeguards and unqualified right of appeal in connection with a decision to invoke the Federal licensing procedure.

Another major provision of the bill authorizes the Commission to suspend the application of Federal licensing procedures when it finds, after a hearing, that regional, State, or local regulations will adequately effectuate the purposes of the act. This suspension or retrocession of jurisdiction over Federal waters would be subject to routine review after 5 years, and extraordinary reconsideration at an earlier date, if an investigation and hearing reveal that a particular jurisdiction had fallen below Federal standards in its water use policy.

The bill also provides the Commission with the powers to deal with two classes of acute problems: water shortages and water emergencies. Where the Commission finds that a shortage exists or is developing, it may take such steps as requiring water rotation, barring new water uses, and prorating available supplies among existing users. Where these steps are inadequate to protect public health and safety, the Commission may take more urgent measures, such as outright water rationing and emergency appropriation of private water supplies.

Of course, after the Federal Water Commission is in operation, it should de-

18572

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 3, 1965

velop a long range plan of allocation. If this plan is executed properly, shortages will be anticipated, and we will not live from crisis to crisis.

Finally, the bill makes two changes in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. First, it deletes altogether the ban on planning interbasin water transfers. Second, it recasts the Water Resource Council in the role of an advisory committee to the Commission. This conforms the Council's role to the original 1956 proposal of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resource Policy, which envisaged the Council as an advisory committee to a water resource coordinator who would be in turn responsible to the President.

Mr. Speaker, the principal effect of my bill would be to establish a Federal Water Commission as a water policy review board, dealing chiefly with the laws and regulations of other governmental agencies and political subdivisions. As such, it should be acceptable in principle to those who have confidence in the wisdom of their region's allocation of its water resources and wish to retain discretionary control at the regional or local level.

The Federal Government has responded to the critical water shortage in the Northeast with prompt technical assistance to regional, State and local authorities.

However, Federal action thus far has failed to face the hard fact that we must have an integrated national policy of water conservation, water development, and water pollution control. It is inconceivable and, in view of the present crisis, intolerable to reject the principle of Federal coordination for water resources when we now embrace it actively in developing a national electric power grid. Water is quite obviously a scarcer resource and far more vulnerable to the devastating caprices of nature. The Federal Water Commission bill I have introduced today would close this glaring gap in our nation's resource policy in a way consistent with both existing regional differences and the paramount necessity of securing an ample, constant water supply for all citizens of the United States.

Reuss
IN ORDER THAT THE UNITED NATIONS MAY BE EFFECTIVE IN VIETNAM, WE MUST REHABILITATE IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the body of the Record in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the President deserves high praise for his action last week in invoking the United Nations in the Vietnam situation. By his letter to Secretary General U Thant ask-

ing "that all the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to bring peace in Vietnam," and by his instructing Ambassador Arthur Goldberg to communicate the matter to the members of the Security Council, we have shown that we respect the United Nations and intend to use it.

What comes out of the United Nations depends on what its members are willing to put into it. I therefore hope and pray for a United Nations call for a cease-fire, for United Nations-sponsored negotiations between all interested parties, for United Nations supervised elections to enable the people of South Vietnam to decide their own future, and for a United Nations program of economic development for all of southeast Asia.

The case for United Nations responsibility for southeast Asia was well stated 15 years ago by then Secretary of State Dean Acheson in his January 12, 1950, speech to the National Press Club in Washington:

What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area, and what is our policy in regard to it?

In the first place, the defeat and the disarmament of Japan has placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in the interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific * * *.

This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands, and those we will continue to hold * * *.

The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our defensive relations with the Philippines are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out and will be loyally carried out.

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. * * * Should such an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the charter of the United Nations which so far has not proved a weak reed to lean on by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression.

Those words were valid then, and they are valid now.

The President's action in involving the United Nations is itself the best answer to those in high places who have been raising all manner of objections to involving the United Nations.

It is said that the United Nations cannot play a useful role where the great powers are involved. In fact, the United Nations has more than once intervened effectively in just such a case. In 1950, despite the opposition of the Soviet Union, the defense of South Korea was mounted under the banner of the United Nations. While the Korean United Nations action escaped a Russian veto because Russia had absented herself from the Security Council, the possibility of United Nations action even had there been a Russian veto was assured by the

invention of the "uniting for peace" procedure under which the General Assembly can act. In the Middle East conflict of 1956, a United Nations cease-fire was obtained against the force of the United Kingdom and France, which, to their credit, respected the cease-fire. In the Congo and Cyprus, the United Nations played a role where the great powers were indirectly involved. Great powers as well as small are likewise not exempt from the United Nations writ in Vietnam.

It is said that there is no role for the United Nations in Vietnam because North Vietnam and Communist China have rejected and ridiculed a United Nations role. Their objection is as irrelevant as the unheeded objection of North Korea to United Nations action in 1950. Certainly it was never intended that the aggressor should decide whether he would be subject to United Nations peacekeeping action.

Equally, it is irrelevant that North Vietnam and Communist China are not members of the United Nations. Article II of the U.N. Charter expressly states:

The organization shall insure that states which are not members act in accordance with United Nations principles.

It is said that our invoking the United Nations will be taken as a sign of weakness by our adversaries, and as a harbinger of American withdrawal. But President Johnson's signals are hardly those of weakness; and the evidence so far certainly points to no misapprehension by North Vietnam and Communist China on this score.

It is said that our invocation of the United Nations would lead to acrimonious debate in the Security Council and the General Assembly on the U.S. position. But such debate, in and out of the United Nations, is sure to occur anyway. It will have infinitely less foundation if we show our respect for article I of the United Nations Charter, which defines its purpose as "to maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

It is said that invocation of the United Nations would force the Soviet Union into the arms of Communist China, and heal the breach caused by differing views of violent takeovers by "wars of liberation." The Soviet Union in any event faces the dilemma posed by conflicting desires: On the one hand, to avoid heightened danger of conflict with the United States and, on the other hand, to show itself the champion of world communism.

If the Soviet Union is not going to intervene militarily against us in Vietnam without our going to the United Nations, I cannot see her intervening militarily if we do go to the United Nations with a set of peace aims that are instinct with justice for all the world to see. No one can tell whether the Soviet Union will oppose, or veto, formal United Nations action, if it comes to that. But if there is a Soviet veto, there is then the General Assembly, under the uniting-for-peace procedure.

It is said, finally, that if all other United Nations procedures of mediation, arbitration, and recommendation are exhausted, and the matter then comes before the General Assembly, the General Assembly may decline to take action or vote it down. I do not for a moment concede the point: if we will now move to rehabilitate the United Nations, I am confident that the requisite majority of the General Assembly would take a stand for peace and for the independence of small nations. But even if the United Nations should in the end shirk its responsibility, we shall at least have shown our dedication to the United Nations and our willingness to abide by our commitments under the Charter.

But as a matter of the first urgency, we must overcome the present paralysis in the United Nations caused by the year-old dispute about the financing of prior United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. The Soviet Union and France are both more than 2 years in arrears in paying their assessments on peacekeeping forces which they opposed. Under the letter of article 19, they are thus subject to the loss of their votes in the General Assembly. Last August the Congress, with administration encouragement, passed a concurrent resolution calling on the permanent U.S. delegate to the United Nations to "make every effort to assure invocation of article 19. The Soviet Union threatened to withdraw if denied its vote, and there was a good chance that France would do likewise. The result was that the last session of the General Assembly ended in paralysis, with no votes allowed to be taken.

The confrontation in the United Nations stemming from our concurrent resolution of last summer, if it is still in effect when the General Assembly convenes next month, will result either in our defeat or in the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and France from the world organization. For that reason, I introduced last April House Concurrent Resolution 386, which will permit our permanent delegate to the United Nations flexibility in handling the article 19 problem, and not compel him to torpedo the United Nations when it meets. For the future, we should support the proposition that General Assembly peacekeeping operations be financed by voluntary contributions. For the past, the United States, while remaining zealous to invoke article 19 against the countries in arrears in their regular United Nations dues, should not press article 19 on the Middle East and Congo special assessments.

Congress has just a few weeks to act before September is upon us. I hope that the State Department will act upon House Concurrent Resolution 386, or some similar resolution, to end the United Nations impasse. When the United Nations is revived, it will be able to play a meaningful role in bringing peace to Vietnam.

Of one thing I am sure—that the American people wholeheartedly support a United Nations role in Vietnam. In

an opinion poll conducted in Milwaukee by the Milwaukee Sentinel, and reported in the Sentinel for August 2, 1965, 70 percent of those asked, "Do you feel it is time for the United Nations to step in to find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam?" answered "Yes;" 7 percent said "No," with 18 percent saying "Don't know," and 5 percent not answering. I include the Milwaukee Sentinel story:

POLL FINDS SUPPORT FOR L.B.J.—U.S. BUILD-UP IN VIETNAM BACKED
(By C. Brooks Smeeton)

The majority of Milwaukee area residents support President Johnson's commitment to a stepped up role for the United States in the Vietnam war.

This is despite the fact that almost one-half of those polled feel the President's decision to double the draft call and to increase the U.S. fighting strength is risking a major war with Red China.

More than 6 out of 10 persons agree with President Johnson's order to double the monthly draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000 and to send 50,000 more men to South Vietnam.

This compares with only about 1 in 5 (19 percent) who disagree with the idea, or (18 percent) who don't know.

One hundred persons were interviewed by telephone for the Sentinel by the research department of the Journal Co. Of those who participated in the poll, 59 percent were women and 41 percent were men.

Interviewers asked individuals throughout the metropolitan Milwaukee area for their opinions about the statement last Wednesday on Vietnam by President Johnson.

Almost half—47 percent—said that they read about it in the newspaper while almost one-third—28 percent—listened to or watched the speech on radio or television.

The results revealed that 40 percent agree that this action on the part of the United States will bring peace eventually. Twenty percent were in disagreement; 35 percent replied they didn't know and 5 percent did not answer.

"If we didn't do it now it would lead to total war," said Howard Bruchkauser, 2709 East Whitaker Avenue, St. Francis.

Also in agreement was Thomas K. Anderson, 3455 South 104th Street, Greenfield. He said, "I like the forwardness in the President's stand. It's time we show them that we mean business and we will fight to protect our freedom."

Walter Waech, 4853 North 66th Street, indicated he felt the same way when he replied, "It's the old Teddy Roosevelt theory of 'carry a big stick.' We've been horsing around too long."

SAME AS KOREA

There were some who disagreed. In the opinion of John H. Ebbe, 3234 South 82d Street, "It's the same as Korea—fighting to establish a status quo."

Forty-eight percent of those polled felt the action by the United States is risking a major war with Red China. Twenty-nine percent said they did not think so, while 19 percent said they didn't know.

The women (almost 50 percent) were more apprehensive than the men (46 percent) about the possibility of this country getting into a war with Communist China.

Seven out of ten of the participants in the survey said that it was time for the United Nations to step in to find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam.

Among those who felt this was Eldon Zich, 16032 Riviera Drive, New Berlin, who said, "I've felt that way for a long time. It's the job for the U.N. They should have tried to keep peace."

EASIER THAN FORCE

John Kallas, 2574 South 35th Street, said, "I believe in the U.N. They can settle problems easier than brute force."

Donald Weber, 5856 North 61st Street, said, "It's part of United Nations business to do this. They have made no noticeable effort as yet."

Oscar Murphy, Jr., 2958-A North 12th Street, said, "The United States got themselves into it, so they should get themselves out."

William Anderson, 3702 West Sarnow Street, said, "I am negative on United Nations. They don't have too much to say. They're too far to the left."

Mrs. Ray Wotta, 2545 South 66th Street, said, "The United Nations will never settle anything."

Here are the Sentinel poll questions and the results:

"Did you happen to listen or watch President Johnson's speech Wednesday on Vietnam?"

	Percent
Yes.....	28
No.....	69
No answer.....	3

"Did you read in the newspaper about President Johnson's statement on Vietnam?"

	Percent
Yes.....	47
No.....	50
No answer.....	3

"Do you agree or disagree with President Johnson's decision to double the monthly draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000 and to send 50,000 more men to South Vietnam?"

	Percent
Agree.....	61
Disagree.....	19
Do not know.....	18
No answer.....	2

"Do you agree or disagree that this action on the part of the United States will bring peace eventually?"

	Percent
Agree.....	40
Disagree.....	20
Do not know.....	35
No answer.....	5

"Do you feel it is time for the United Nations to step in to find ways to halt this aggression and bring peace to Vietnam?"

	Percent
Yes.....	70
No.....	7
Do not know.....	18
No answer.....	5

"Do you feel this action by the United States is risking major war with Red China?"

	Percent
Yes.....	48
No.....	29
Do not know.....	19
No answer.....	4

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to congratulate the gentleman for the very important statement he is making to the House this afternoon. I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

I was personally very pleased that the President in his press conference last Wednesday stated that he had sent Ambassador Goldberg with a special message to Secretary General U Thant urging him to make full use of the resources of the U.N. in bringing the war from the battlefield to the conference table. I have been urging that this be done for

some months now. I also have been encouraging every official of our administration with whom I have talked to make every effort to include the United Nations in every step and that it be encouraged to play a larger role in this effort.

However, my question to the gentleman at this point, in light of some of the comments he has made about the prospects of the United Nations perhaps being turned down, is that I notice in the United Press International dispatch this morning that North Vietnam has ruled out any United Nations role in bringing the war to the conference table or for any international settlement. So I ask the gentleman, Do you really think it is possible we can get the other party to the conference table or to the United Nations in light of what they have had to say?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. Hanoi in the past has shown its contempt for the United Nations, and it has done so again in the last 24 hours. However, I remind the gentleman that the United Nations Charter, article 2, expressly states, and I quote:

The organization shall insure that States which are not members act in accordance with United Nations principles.

So the mere fact that North Vietnam resists United Nations action, and is not a member of the United Nations, is irrelevant.

Equally in 1950, North Korea resisted the U.N. action and was not a member of the U.N. Yet that did not stop the U.N. from assuming what I think history will regard as an important role in damping down that threat to world peace. I do not want to minimize the difficulties of the situation, but I do not think that the intransigence of North Vietnam offers the slightest excuse for the U.N. to shirk its responsibilities.

Mr. COHELAN. If the gentleman will yield further, did I understand him clearly in respect to the parties with whom we should negotiate? Do I understand that the gentleman includes any and all parties that might properly be associated with an honorable settlement? By this I mean the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong, or any other party, that may be present and available to negotiate. Is that not correct?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I said all parties and I mean all parties, including those who are now most responsible for carrying on the conflict, that is, the Vietcong. President Johnson in his press conference of last week indicated if the North Vietnamese wished to bring along the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front to negotiations, that would be acceptable, and that statement speaks for itself. Speaking for myself, I would think we have to negotiate with whomever our opponents are, and we can leave juridical considerations as to whether a group of people is a government or not to one side. They are the people who are firing at us, and they will have to be dealt with.

Mr. COHELAN. Now, if the gentleman will yield further at this point on just one other matter before he completes his comprehensive statement.

As the gentleman well knows from our own discussions, from discussions with very distinguished colleagues of ours including the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] who at one time was a delegate to the United Nations, and with members of the administration, there has been concern expressed about us going to the United Nations at this point and possibly causing some embarrassment, particularly in relation to article 19.

Now I realize the gentleman has commented on article 19, and we have to do something about this. But I wonder if he would concentrate on the question of the reservations that are entertained by some of our colleagues who are equally anxious to bring the United Nations pressure to bear in this terrible situation in southeast Asia.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. I would say two things in reply to him.

First, as to the tactics and timing of our United Nations invocation, on which we are now happily embarked, I believe that the tactics and timing must very much be left to those who are directly in charge of the day-to-day conduct of our foreign policy. Thus I do not call this afternoon for any particular resolution to be presented before any particular body of the United Nations at any particular time. It may well be that the initial step taken, of having Ambassador Goldberg simply lodge the matter informally before the 11 members of the Security Council, is a good initial proceeding. I will recognize that to take a frozen formal position at the outset might not be the most productive way to proceed. So my first answer to the gentleman's question is that the important thing is that we are now before the United Nations. We are not any longer being disrespectful of it by refusing to come before the United Nations. And this I consider half or two-thirds of the battle.

I would hope that our timing and tactics will prove fruitful in the days and weeks and months to come.

The second point I would make has to do with article 19; and that is that whatever we do with the United Nations is totally dependent upon our putting the United Nations back on its feet again. It is now in a state of paralysis owing to the assessments dispute, and we must move fast to see that some sort of a workable compromise can be arrived at on that, so that the United Nations when it meets in New York next month may be once again a going institution.

I point out to the gentleman that this will require action by the U.S. Congress, because the Congress has presently saddled our permanent representative at the United Nations with a rather inflexible resolution which in effect requires that on opening day of the new General Assembly, he has got to challenge the right of France and of the Soviet Union to vote, and both countries, if that challenge were upheld, would be highly likely to leave the United Nations and thus start the tragic course toward a repetition of the last days of the ill-fated League of Nations.

Therefore, it is in my judgment vital

that the State Department and Congress move within the next few weeks, preferably the next few days, to clarify our directive of last summer which was made in good faith—I voted for it, and so, I believe, did the gentleman from California, with all other Members—but, in effect, our confrontation strategy of last year regrettably did not work, and we are now confronted with a larger question of whether we wish the United Nations to continue.

I believe the American people want the United Nations to continue. In a poll conducted in my own community of Milwaukee over the weekend by the Milwaukee Sentinel, 70 percent of the persons queried on whether they wished the U.N. participation in Vietnam said yes, they did; only 7 percent said no; 18 percent said they did not know, and 5 percent did not answer.

So that I think the American people share the faith of the gentleman from California and myself and so many other Members that the United Nations does have an inspiring role to play in world peace if only we will do our part in putting it on its feet again.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for amplifying this point, and again I want to express my complete agreement with what he has had to say.

I shall have further questions of the gentleman as the gentleman proceeds.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour I am going to exercise my permission to insert materials in the Record and conclude my formal remarks by expressing the deep hope that the State Department will shortly act on the question of the U.N. impasse, that it will give a favorable report on the resolution which I introduced last April to give our representative, Ambassador Goldberg, more flexibility on the article 19 question or perhaps come up with some similar resolution, so that the United Nations may be revived and thus able to play a meaningful role in bringing peace to Vietnam.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his timely discussion of a most urgent question, a question which is of vital concern to the security of our Nation as well as to the future of the world.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is worth noting the point which the gentleman has developed, which is that before we can return to the United Nations for assistance in settling the Vietnam problem, we must first work out the problems that have kept the General Assembly from functioning over the past year. Because most of the small nations do not want to see in the General Assembly a confrontation between the United States, the Soviet Union, and France on the question of paying these assessments for the peacekeeping costs, we are going to have to recognize this as a reality and proceed to find other ways to move ahead so that the General Assembly can continue to act and function in dealing with problems around the world.

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18575

I might say, if the gentleman will yield further for a moment, that there is one point that I believe the gentleman touched upon with which I surely concur. That is the argument that by taking the issue of Vietnam to the Security Council, we would force the Soviet Union into a position of representing North Vietnam thereby committing the Soviet Union to a firmer and harder line than that to which it is presently committed.

It seems to me that while this question or consideration once had validity, today we find the Soviet Union furnishing not only economic aid but substantial military assistance, including surface-to-air missiles for North Vietnam, and warning our Government about the grave risks that we face in our course of conduct over there and demanding the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam.

It would seem to me that it would be hard to get the Soviet Union more deeply committed to a defensive posture on behalf of North Vietnam than that to which it is already committed as a result of its common interest with North Vietnam as a member of the Communist group of nations.

I do not know if the gentleman from Wisconsin has pursued that point to the degree that we have discussed earlier, but I do believe that this consideration which, as I say, once had validity, no longer does have the validity that it may have had in the earlier months.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota that while the question of the involvement of the Soviet Union in the question of a U.N. presence in South Vietnam is a serious one, it deserves a fair discussion.

I believe, on balance, that the case is overwhelmingly in favor of going to the U.N., and letting the chips fall where they may. The Soviet Union has already found it necessary, because of its position in the Communist world, to take very considerable steps to align itself with North Vietnam.

I do not see how that alignment is going to become any worse by reason of our bringing the matter before the United Nations.

Certainly, if in a given situation the Soviet Union, before we take the matter to the United Nations, is not going to take military step X against us, then equally the Soviet Union is not going to take military step X simply because we went to the United Nations. The United Nations invests us with a much better world standing than we have through ignoring the United Nations. So I think we are better off with respect to the Soviet Union and everybody else through going to the United Nations.

The second point I would like to make is that the worst that the Soviet Union can do to us in the United Nations, if it comes to that—I hope it will not—is to veto such resolutions as have been offered in the Security Council by us, or any other member. There is then available to us the General Assembly, under a procedure invented because of the Soviet Union's veto power. There is that great forum, with its 114 member nations, where I am confident a justly

conceived and stated American case can attract the majority of votes.

Mr. FRASER. There is another consideration which might be worth developing. In the earlier years many people had in mind asking the United Nations to declare the actions on the part of North Vietnam to be acts of aggression and calling upon the United Nations for support in meeting that aggression. It is true we could go to the United Nations today and ask the Security Council or the General Assembly to declare that aggression is being waged by North Vietnam and call on them for help. That is one course of action that is open, but it seems to me in light of recent developments and in the changing complexities of the situation we are more likely to urge the United Nations to take a peace-seeking role.

Mr. REUSS. Rather than in a police force role?

Mr. FRASER. Yes. Leaving aside the question of aggression, you could go to the Security Council or to the General Assembly and seek through their offices to find a resolution to this conflict. In such a case the Soviet Union would not find itself pressed to defend North Vietnam and thereby become more deeply committed as some fear. What has been established since the United Nations has been in business is that they will recognize overt aggression and will act to meet such aggression. That was demonstrated in the case of Korea, although it is true Russia was not in the Security Council at that time; nevertheless, the other nations all recognized North Korea was invading South Korea, and they did authorize a United Nations force to take action in support of South Korea.

But here we have a war in which there are arguments about the nature of the war. Some call it a civil war just as we had a civil war between the North and South here in the United States. Others say the moral issues are obscured because the United States did not support the elections provided under the Geneva agreement. There are moral questions raised by those who discuss Vietnam. Where there are some complexities and an argument about whether or not there is truly aggression, we do have one other route to follow, and that is the route of self-determination. There is no dispute about the issue that the people of the area ought to decide by the ballot box rather than by bullets what kind of leadership they want. It is here we could move forward, and the United Nations can play an extremely useful role.

The value of moving in this direction is that if we advocate self-determination and if we say we are prepared to accept a vote by the people of South Vietnam—and I was happy to see that the President took that position the other day in his speech—then it seems to me that puts us clearly on the moral side, on the side of the angels. What ever disputes there are about the origins of this war or the morality of it, if we can go to the United Nations and say we are prepared to ask their good offices and their help in creating machinery to carry out some kind of a political decision process such as the use of the ballot

box with a referendum or by an election of some kind, this would be consistent with the highest purposes of the United Nations. It would be consistent with the spirit of the small new nations for which self-determination stands as perhaps the highest political principle of any that are abroad in the world today.

Before I ask the gentleman to comment on this, I might mention a proposal that the President could make. This is only for illustrative purposes. He might say, for example, to the United Nations that we are prepared to support a United Nations sponsored referendum in South Vietnam on the question of the political leadership that the people desire—with the questions to be framed under United Nations jurisdiction.

Further, he could suggest that a cease-fire take place in South Vietnam so that the United Nations representatives would have access to all of South Vietnam in carrying out such an election.

Third, he could say that if these steps are agreed upon, and this would involve, I think, a direct contact by the United Nations with the Vietcong or with the national liberation front, if those steps could be agreed upon, then of course we would suspend bombing in the North and agree to abide by the outcome of the election, as we would expect all other nations to do.

Now I recognize the many problems that exist in this proposal. I recognize that the United Nations really has not done this before. But necessity is the mother of invention and if there should be some willingness to proceed to allow the people of South Vietnam, who are the people whose interests are ultimately at stake, to make a decision by going to the ballot box—if we could move in that direction through the United Nations, it seems to me this would clearly put us square with the world and our own conscience and the highest principles of American democracy.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman, as he always does, has made good sense. I think his proposal is a sound one.

I would add that it is in no way inconsistent with the observations of President Johnson at his press conference last week. Indeed, it simply carries out and makes a little more definite what was said there by the President.

The gentleman has well said that, while these things have not been done in exactly this way by the United Nations before, the fact is the United Nations Charter, like the great Constitution of this country and like the British Common-Law Constitution, is capable of infinite adjustment, within its four corners, to the turn of events.

Specifically, I think a combination of a United Nations directed cease-fire which of course, would operate on our bombers and would operate on the Vietcong and on North Vietnam and on the Saigon government; the suggestion for United Nations-sponsored negotiations; and the suggestion, which I think is perhaps the most important of all, for United Nations supervised elections in South Vietnam—this is the essence of a proposal which, if made a little more formally by our Government, and I think we are

reaching in that direction now, will appeal to the sense of justice of people the world over. After all, that is our only refuge and strength. I think the gentleman has made a real contribution.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman has cataloged the points that are important in any kind of United Nations proposal which would lead to free election machinery to determine the future of Vietnam and/or of South Vietnam.

My question at this point relates to the machinery. While it is true that we could organize elections, I think it is pretty clear one of the reasons we failed to sign the Geneva accords in 1954 was because we could not get U.N. guaranteed and supervised elections.

My question to the gentleman is: What do we propose? What can we propose? What techniques and methods will be suggested or can be suggested to arrange for the peacekeeping costs? Obviously, if there is a cease fire it is highly desirable to have an enforceable cease fire under U.N. supervision. Given some of the difficulties of which we are all aware, what does the gentleman envision as the means for sorting this one out?

Mr. REUSS. Of course, the costs of a United Nations-supervised election would be negligible and could be borne out of regular United Nations dues, and there would be no problem, because there has been no disposition on the part of members generally to refuse to pay their dues.

If, however, a United Nations peacekeeping presence of some sort may be necessary, a United Nations police force—bear in mind that in my colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota just a moment ago I agreed that there were other U.N. functions and operations which seemed to be more significant right now—in Vietnam or anywhere else in the world, I should think in the future, to the extent that the General Assembly of the United Nations set up a police force, the financing should be done on a voluntary basis, just as a world organization like the International Development Association, before it makes up a consortium, goes to the various members and says, "How much can we put you down for?" If the member says, "Nothing on this one," the IDA secretary says, "Fine, we will put you down for nothing."

So, with respect to future General Assembly peacekeeping forces, because of their exacerbating nature on some of the members, it would not hurt to make their financing voluntary.

If it be said that then the United States may in a given case bear the lion's share of the burden, I would answer by saying, first, only if the United States agreed, and, second, how much better it would be if we were today bearing the lion's share and more than the lion's share of the burden in South Vietnam under the banner of the United Nations, and with the help of numerous other members of the United Nations. How much ahead, both financially and morally, we would be.

I believe, in answer to the question of the gentleman from California, there are

ways of working out even expensive peacekeeping forces without wrenching the United Nations apart.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I was interested in the question of the gentleman from California and the response by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There is an additional procedure which could be followed by the United Nations which would also, I believe, provide additional flexibility. I refer to creating a peacekeeping fund in advance, in a predetermined amount—it might be \$500 million or some other figure—which would have the value of insulating a particular peacekeeping operation from the request for support of that fund. One cannot insulate it entirely, and it may depend on the magnitude of the peacekeeping operation.

I might say that one of the objections raised to the idea of having a peacekeeping fund established in advance is the possibility that the smaller nations, who control the General Assembly, might undertake to go off on their own and initiate some kind of action which we would not feel was in the interest of the United States. I mention this because it is a common objection. On that point, it seems to me we have so many other things to fear which are more real and more immediate that such a remote contingency could not seriously impair our national security. I believe we should look at the possibility of establishing such a fund as one of the possible ways to provide the United Nations with the flexibility which I very strongly feel it needs.

Mr. REUSS. I would certainly agree that this is an idea worth exploring. If it ever could be achieved, it would be a most helpful addition to the United Nations arsenal of peaceful weapons.

I return, however, to my theme, which is that immediately we are confronted with the stubborn fact that the U.N. has fallen apart and that our most immediate urgent task is to move heaven and earth to put it back together again.

There is no reason under the sun why in about 5 weeks from now the United Nations cannot be on its feet, financially sound once again, with hope for the future and, I would think, with the gratitude ringing in our ears of about 80 small nations for the initiative of the United States in trying to put the United Nations back on its feet, if we will but do what has to be done in the Halls of Congress, and in the executive branch in the 3 or 4 vital weeks to come.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. speaker, I always listen carefully to our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. He is truly one of the outstanding scholars in the Congress and a thoughtful and knowledgeable internationalist. I read with appreciation his recent article on the U.N. in *Commonweal* magazine. I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin on his continuing efforts in support of the U.N. and thank him for taking this time today to

discuss the U.N. and its vital place in this modern world.

Mr. Speaker, I emphatically deny that fate decrees that wars are inevitable. As Schopenhauer said, what people commonly call fate is, as a general rule, nothing but their own stupid and foolish conduct, and if wickedness is atoned for in another world, stupidity gets its reward here.

I am convinced that there is a proper and well defined path we can and must take in our foreign policy. I say that the ground rules are existing and have been enumerated by wise leaders, living and dead. Sir Isaac Newton said:

If I have seen farther than other men it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants.

I ask only that we stand open eyed, on the shoulders of our giants.

I suppose that I realized that the day of world wars was over and done with on August 6, 1945, when our aircraft dropped the first atomic bomb and in a few seconds leveled a great city and killed 77,000 people.

You will recall that this was a few months after the Germans had started using the V-2 rocket, which was fired from hidden sites, which flew so fast that the sound of the missile did not catch up until after the explosion.

It seemed apparent on that day that substitutes would have to be found for warfare, that it would not be too many years before any reasonably modern nation could construct both the missiles and the nuclear warheads capable of destroying any other country or combination of countries. Any new Tojo, Hitler, Kaiser, Napoleon, or Genghis Khan now had the means of pulling down the rest of the world, whether in revenge or in a frenzy of paranoia.

Today we have enough atomic bombs to kill every Russian over 1,000 times, and they in turn can do the same to us.

It does not matter who strikes first. The bombs and the means of transmittal are hidden in hardened sites or on submarines which cannot be found, and the nation first attacked will always have sufficient missiles left to destroy the enemy.

For a few short years only ourselves and the Russians were atomic nations. It was our hope that there would be no further proliferation. We resembled the trustees of the church in southern California upon whose property oil was discovered. The next day the trustees announced that no more new members would be accepted.

But today we find 10, perhaps 15, other nations with actual or potential nuclear arsenals. France, whose force de frappe military experts sniffed at not many months ago, has an operational force of 36 Mirage supersonic bombers armed with atomic bombs each with an explosive force of 60 kilotons, or 4 times the Hiroshima bomb. The French force will soon be double this size, and military experts say that more than 50 percent would reach their targets.

China has now exploded two atom bombs. Those who assume that China will have no missile delivery system would do well to remember that the Chi-

nese invented the rocket. The consensus of expert opinion is that industrialized nations such as West Germany and Japan could join the atomic club in 2 years. Other nations that have the industrial and scientific capabilities include Italy, Israel, India, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, and Indonesia.

We would consider it imbecilic for a city to attempt to exist without government—as an anarchy—without community rules restricting the violent behavior of its citizens. But the nations in the world today have no effective government or rules of law limiting their sovereignty. The sovereign state assumes the right to take any action to serve what it considers its vital interests and to judge the appropriateness of its acts, no matter how serious the consequences to others.

This system never has worked—it cannot work. "There is no greater fiend than anarchy," said Sophocles. "She ruins states, turns houses out of doors." In my lifetime alone, international anarchy has resulted in two world wars, in the violent deaths of a hundred million people, in hunger and poverty for two-thirds of the world's population, and in a breakdown of governments permitting Communist rule over half the world's population.

Even in the brief periods between wars, the preparations for the next conflict so impoverish the world community economically and spiritually, that long-range success in the development of the underdeveloped nations is impossible.

World expenditures for armaments per year total over \$120 billions, of which the United States spends 42 percent. In late May it was announced that our Nation has the doubtful honor of being the biggest arms merchant in the world, with sales of \$1.5 billion this year and a special arms sales promotion program in Western Europe costing \$500,000 a year.

With the nations of the world spending \$120 billion per year on arms, it is clear that there is not enough money left over for aid to the underdeveloped countries.

As Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn have pointed out, there must be an annual flow of capital from the industrialized nations to the low-income countries of not less than \$50 billion per year—or \$25 per capita. The current flow of \$8.5 billion is only one-sixth of what is required to make any real impression on the problem.

Unless the developed nations allocate this larger sum of capital to the low-income nations, we should not be surprised if they develop monolithic economic and political systems. Communist revolutions are not caused by the Communist doctrine, they are caused by disease and the lack of the decencies of life. These revolutions will continue even if communism evaporates.

It was 2 years and 2 months ago that President Kennedy made his immortal speech on world peace at American University here in Washington. It seemed to me at that time, and I have not since changed my mind, that his words signified a new direction in American foreign policy.

He said that world peace is the most important topic on earth. He said that war is not inevitable—that mankind is not doomed—that we are not gripped by forces we cannot control.

He said:

Our problems are man made—therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants.

That:

World peace, like community peace, does not require that each man love his neighbor—it requires only that they live together in mutual tolerance, submitting their disputes to a just and peaceful settlement.

President Kennedy said:

We seek to strengthen the United Nations * * * to develop it into a genuine world security system—a system capable of resolving disputes on the basis of law * * * and of creating conditions under which arms can be finally abolished.

You will recall that within a few short weeks the Soviet Union and our country had signed the test ban treaty, outlawing atmospheric atomic testing. At the time of his death we appeared to be close to an extension of the treaty to include underground explosions. President Kennedy had traveled to England, Ireland, and to Europe. He was looked upon as the leader who might fulfill Tennyson's dream of a time "when all men's good be each man's rule, and universal peace lie like a shaft of light across the land."

It seems to me that our commitment to build world law and order is being weakened by our actions. We appear to be disassociating ourselves from a foreign policy whose matrix is the U.N. and instead giving increasing importance to unilateral power politics.

I say that this course can only lead to disaster—that man's only hope for world peace is through constant honest efforts toward world organization—that we cannot say it won't work until we have tried—and that our attempts to date have been timid and unenthusiastic.

It is my position that support of the U.N. must be the core of our foreign policy. I believe that the United States can lead its sister states on the road to a world community where disputes are settled not by war but by conciliation and arbitration.

Where the United Nations has been allowed by its members to operate, its successes have been solid and satisfying. International cooperation has been the rule in the World Health Organization, UNICEF, UNESCO, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the Monetary Fund, the World Bank, GATT, the expanded program of technical assistance, and many more.

The first and primary purpose, however, of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security. The charter specifically requires that member States shall use no force except in self-defense—that the use of self-defense must be reported to the Security Council, and that members must settle their disputes peacefully.

The charter contemplates that nations in dispute shall first seek a solution through peaceful means of their own choosing. Then, if a solution is not

found, the dispute must be referred to the U.N. before it erupts into war.

In its first few years considerable respect was paid to this commitment. Russia withdrew its troops from Iran and France hers from Syria to avoid charges of charter violation. The U.N. helped restore peace in Greece, Kashmir, and Korea. In Israel peace was maintained when the state was first established and again during the Suez crisis.

But this pattern of generally responsible conduct has degenerated during the past decade into the practice of nations taking the law into their own hands and using force without first submitting the case to the U.N. There was Britain and France in Suez, India in Goa, Russia in Hungary, the United States in Vietnam.

It might possibly be argued that the use of force would be legitimate where a member in good faith first seeks assistance through the U.N. and fails to receive it. There is no excuse for by-passing the U.N.

More and more we have been reversing the proper order of conduct in international affairs. Our charter obligation is to first submit the dispute to the international governmental authority and only thereafter back up its decision with force. There is no authority to move militarily first, seeking conciliation later.

In recent years it is said more and more that the charter does not forbid one nation from helping another quell a rebellion. This is certainly an imaginative but unsupportable conclusion. There is no authority in the charter for one nation to intervene militarily in another country whether there exists a civil war, a war of liberation, or a war in the defense of freedom.

No state has the right to intervene in another state's civil war. If the civil war constitutes a threat to international peace, then the U.N. may intervene to deal with this threat.

There is nothing in the charter to justify the great powers or the small powers rejecting or ignoring conciliation, mediation or the other peacekeeping processes of the U.N. The law of the charter, its very heart, outlaws force as a method for settling disputes.

Nor are military alliances a substitute for the treaty obligations of the U.N. Charter. NATO provides no machinery or means for settling disputes, except the use of force, or the threat of force. We have seen from NATO no arms control proposals. Indeed, NATO historically has looked with a jaundiced eye on any plans for disengagement, disarmament or the establishment of arms-free areas in Europe.

I am not saying that there is a single path to peace and that it consists of a more faithful adherence to the rules of the charter. There still would remain many intractable problems requiring additional remedies. The U.N. must, of course, be open to every nation including China. There must be giant steps toward disarmament and the formation of an international police force. The World Court's jurisdiction must be enlarged and strengthened. There must be in the General Assembly a more realistic distribution of voting power.

But these are difficult, perhaps impossible achievements in the hostile atmosphere of the cold war. What I suggest is that one step is possible—one is immediately achievable—and that is for the member nations to cease forthwith their neglect of the U.N. and their solemn, written obligations under its charter. Regardless of whether or not there are defects in the charter, it is up to its signatories to make faithful and diligent efforts to comply with its provisions.

A constitution, any set of rules or laws, any charter, is only as effective as the good faith of its members. There are a number of totalitarian nations whose constitutions read much like our own. There is England which has no written constitution, but the long tradition of observance of the law by its citizens creates a law abiding community.

Where law is treated with contempt by powerful and influential segments of the society, the rule of law itself is endangered.

For the past 100 years in certain areas of our South, white men in the position of leadership have said that continuation of the creed of racism is more important than the law. And to this day it is virtually impossible to enforce ordinary criminal statutes against white men who assault or murder Negroes.

A respectable and powerful political leader such as the senior Senator from Virginia will declare that the preservation of segregated schools is more important than respect for Federal law as enunciated in the 1954 school desegregation decisions.

In the community of nations we see the destruction of the international law of the U.N. Charter by the members who, like white Mississippians viewing race, find that the particular conflicts between nations are more important than the preservation of the international machinery for dealing with the conflict.

Russia declares its interest in Hungary is more important than its contract to submit the dispute to the U.N. The United States finds its stake in Vietnam more important than its treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter.

During the past few months we have witnessed a budding respect for law and order in our South and an increasing compliance with the law. Amongst the causes are the three civil rights bills and the various economic pressures exerted by the Federal Government. But important amongst the causes is the emergence of business and Government leaders who say that the quality of civilization that results from compliance with the law is now more important to them than illegal apartheid.

I would suggest that the United States as the world's most powerful and influential nation declare to the world its resolution to comply hereafter with its written contracts—most importantly its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 2 provide:

All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

And further in article 33:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

And article 37 continues:

Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

And even then if the Soviet Union should exercise its veto, there is then the General Assembly to which the matter can be presented under the Uniting for Peace Resolution, which provides:

That if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression, the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I am not impressed with objections that the Uniting for Peace Resolution has been emasculated by France's and Russia's refusal to pay certain peacekeeping assessments or that action by the Security Council will be frustrated by a Soviet veto. In Selma last winter I talked to Sheriff Jim Clark who wore a big badge on his chest that said "Never", and I think it clear now that the integration referred to on Clark's badge will arrive sooner than he thinks.

To follow this course of compliance with what we have contracted to do by signing the U.N. Charter will not be easy. The right-wing will shout appeasement and treason unless every dispute is decided in our favor. Our elected officials must discover new reservoirs of courage and serenity that will subdue the terrors of the timid. We will have to learn to permit our President to truly negotiate in foreign affairs and not force him to be the victor in every skirmish.

And we citizens must find new character traits of sophistication and confidence in the power of our free society to persuade imitation and respect. We will have to be good natured and understanding in our relations with the nations emerging from Colonialism. Some will be headed by leftists and non-conformers who will look with distrust upon our conservatism. They will not always behave as we might want them to, and we will have to learn tolerance as well as patience.

I am afraid that America will find this path difficult and calling for new reservoirs of maturity because of what Toynbee describes as our medieval religious belief that our adversaries have a superhuman wickedness and potency and that it is the manifest destiny of the United States to unilaterally save the world.

We must be more interested in solving problems than in proving theories. All the great powers must learn that their ideologies are as great a source of danger as they are of strength.

I don't pretend to have proposed today any radical steps that, if implemented, will magically produce a world of independent states with adequate international machinery for the peaceful settling of disputes. I suggest, however, that what I have proposed is a logical first move.

As Benjamin V. Cohen recently pointed out, at least the referral of disputes to the U.N. would cause delay so that time would have a chance to operate. Our generation must be wise enough to find ways of leaving to the solvent of time and the wisdom of succeeding generations problems which we of our generation are unable to solve. Let us not forget that the most aggressive ideologies undergo changes over the years. Even the most fanatical faiths balk at self-destruction and mellow with time. As Justice Holmes summed it up, "time has upset many fighting faiths."

A few weeks ago I was in Los Angeles. Automobile after automobile carried bumper stickers. Some read "Impeach Earl Warren." Two read "Register Communists—Not Firearms." Another read "The War on Poverty Means Poverty for All" and still another read "Get the U.S. Out of the U.N." I saw no cars with bumper stickers urging support of the U.N. or of world law. This brought home to me what, I think, Gladstone said, that "Good ends can rarely be attained in politics without passion." In the battle to support and strengthen the United Nations, our opponents seem to have all the passion and it is up to us to counter this with passion of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that our President at his news conference last Wednesday reiterated his faith in the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. I know that our President is devoted to the cause of peace and is seeking with every skill at his command a formula that can result in an honorable peace in Vietnam. I hail the mission he has assigned to Ambassador Goldberg. I have faith that the solution will eventually be found through the U.N.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks, many of us here in Congress have urged a greater United Nations role in searching for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam. We were all, therefore, deeply gratified by President Johnson's remarks last week affirming this country's decision to involve the United Nations in new diplomatic initiatives. Ambassador Goldberg's appointment signaled such a renewed dedication to international peacekeeping. His efforts in communicating with Secretary General U Thant represent new cause for hope.

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18579

It seems to me crucial that the United Nations be the auspices under which peace initiatives are to be taken. Initially, U.N.-sponsored gestures have a greater chance of attracting support from the nonaligned countries whose good will should be a major goal of his country's foreign policy. And, since any eventual settlement should include a guarantor role for the United Nations, it is important that the organization be involved in the quest for peace as early as possible.

Much of the failure of the Geneva settlement in 1954 can be attributed to the inadequacy of strong institutional support and enforcement. The International Control Commission had neither the resources nor the authority with which to implement the difficult peace-keeping role assigned to it. We might now attempt to strengthen the Commission by establishing a United Nations presence at ICC missions. Renovating the diplomatic machinery of the Commission by giving it the support of the United Nations might prove a useful step toward the establishment of an authority equipped to handle the difficult job of supervising peace in Vietnam. The United Nations might also be the mechanism for a gradual disengagement of American and North Vietnamese forces following a ceasefire. And, eventually, full U.N. sponsorship might be given to a new Geneva Convention, with the participation of all relevant parties, whether or not they are members of the United Nations.

I think we should be equally aware of the importance Vietnam can have on the United Nations. Peacekeeping activities by an international body are now generally looked upon with disfavor and skepticism. There is nothing the United Nations needs more than a success. This country can help bring that about, with subtlety and prudence, by seeking to involve the United Nations in every diplomatic initiative and policy which has any chance of succeeding. There is no reason why we cannot be generous in peace. This, of course, is a matter of some delicacy, which is why we are so fortunate to be represented in the United Nations by Ambassador Goldberg.

Finally, let me take this moment to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], for taking this time to deal with the role of the United Nations in Vietnam. He has been an important participant in a debate which for too long has been private and repressed. His thoughtful article in the Commonweal magazine last month has helped many of us develop our own views on the necessity for United Nations activity. We all are grateful for his efforts and diligence.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CXXXXXVIII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. Reuss) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article deals with efforts to im-

plement the poverty program in New York and is part of the series on New York City in Crisis.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on June 6, 1965, and follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 6, 1965]

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY GRANTED \$9.1 MILLION ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

(By Barry Gottehrer and Alfonso Narvaez)

WASHINGTON.—New York City's long-delayed anti-poverty program took a large step forward yesterday when the Office of Economic Opportunity approved a \$9.1-million request in community action funds.

These funds—part of a package first requested by city officials early in March and delayed by the battle over who was to control the program—is the largest single grant so far in the Federal war on poverty.

These funds, awarded for an 8-month period, were accompanied by Sargent Shriver's approval for the formula the city administration has finally worked out to administer the programs.

Mr. Shriver said he is convinced that the newly designed New York City Council Against Poverty, which would give the poor 32 seats out of 100, does meet the Federal law's call for "maximum feasible representation" of the poor.

"I think the New York program now has a generally satisfactory structure," he said. "There is nothing in the law that says fiscal control has to be surrendered by public officials and turned over to the poor. It's up to each community to work out the best formula."

News of the OEO announcement reached Mayor Wagner at Portland, Maine, where he is spending the weekend.

"As soon as the Governor approves the proposal, we will be able to move ahead with action, rather than words," he said.

"We have had some difficulty in our groundbreaking for this effort. A certain amount of controversy developed which was doubtless a healthy thing."

The grant of \$9.1 million in community action funds brings the city's share of Federal anti-poverty funds to more than \$20 million.

When informed of the OEO announcement, Paul Screvane, head of the city's Economic Opportunity Corp.—the operational arm of the city's anti-poverty program—which will receive the funds, said that the city could at last begin to operate its programs.

"The official logjam is over," he said. "Now we will be able shortly to begin to operate our many community action programs. It should be understood that the community action program is not a single monolithic program, but a series of programs, all based on the principle that the local community knows best what it needs, but that a central theme—or umbrella—is necessary to assure all the people in all of the distressed areas that they have equal access to the benefits of the war on poverty, and an equal opportunity to enlist in the war against poverty."

The city's original request for \$10.5 million for the community action phase of the war on poverty was sent to the OEO on March 11.

The Federal grant now goes to Governor Rockefeller who has 30 days in which to approve or reject it. If he takes not action at all at the end of 30 days, the grant will be considered approved.

But May 1 passed without the necessary approval and the city was again forced to modify its proposal.

Then, on May 9, Senator Jacob Javits released a report by the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee which attacked the city's proposal.

However, Sargent Shriver balked at this proposal and asked for a revision of the plan.

He wanted members of community organizations represented on the board.

On April 7, city officials met with the OEO staff and agreed to modify their proposal. They suggested instead an Economic Opportunity Corporation composed of 11 city officials and 4 community representatives. The OEO called this unacceptable.

When the city's proposal went before ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's House Education and Labor subcommittee on April 15, it called for a corporation composed of 11 city officials and five or six community representatives.

Even then, Representative POWELL challenged the city's position and said that the proposed corporation was "monopolistic" and in violation of the Economic Opportunity Act, which called for "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."

Congressman POWELL then asked the Comptroller General to cut off funds for the city's poverty programs. Meanwhile pressure from community groups, social welfare agencies and from several Congressmen representing the city, began to mobilize against the proposed corporation.

On May 11, Mayor Wagner released plans for a completely new arrangement for the city's anti-poverty program. He would create two corporations—an Economic Opportunity Corporation and a Council Against Poverty.

The Economic Opportunity Corporation would still consist of the 11 city officials and six representatives of the community, but the new Council Against Poverty would have a 62-man board of directors, composed of 16 city officials, 40 representatives of community groups and agencies, and six members of the poor.

Even while the Mayor was releasing his new proposal, the OEO said that the inclusion of only six members of the indigenous poor—the target population—was insufficient and that approval would not be forthcoming. It called for a new formula which would have greater representation by the poor.

Reaction in the community also spelled doom for the city's plan. Mass meetings were held in which the poor and members of the already existing community action agencies challenged the city's move. They called for a greater voice in the anti-poverty movement.

Finally on May 24 Mayor Wagner issued an executive order which called for the creation of a Council Against Poverty composed of not more than 100 members. The proposal called for inclusion of 32 members of the poor—two from each of the 16 designated pockets of poverty in the city—and 10 members of community action organizations. The city would have only 16 officials on the Council. The rest would come from social welfare agencies and community leaders.

This new formula was acceptable to the OEO only when the Mayor included a promissory letter pledging that the Council would include the 32 representatives of the poor and 10 representatives of community action groups "within a month—surely no longer than 60 days."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—SHRIVER POLICY LINKED TO HARYOU-ACT CHARGES

COMMUNITY ACTION GIVES POOR A SAY

(The New York City Council Against Poverty has promised the Office of Economic Opportunity that it will enlarge its body to include 32 representatives of the poor, and 10 persons from community-action groups, to comply with the law that states the poor shall have "maximum feasible participation." The following report deals with the problems facing the city in producing these 32 representatives from the 16 communities designated as target areas in New York's anti-poverty campaign.)

18580

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 3, 1965

(By Marshall Peck)

There were some 200 persons in the auditorium at PS 11 on 21st Street, Thursday night, well-dressed and attentive, men and women, young adults, churchmen, a few nuns in a row, gathered for a community meeting. They were told that this was where a democratic program starts.

"What we are doing tonight is the anti-poverty program itself," said the Reverend John H. Wilson, chairman of the evening.

"This meeting makes up and actually constitutes the program. For this program involves getting the people together and hearing their thoughts and suggestions, and planning things out."

As Father Wilson finished, a woman translated his remarks into Spanish.

Discussion

Then Father Wilson moved the microphone down to the auditorium floor and opened the discussion on proposals presented in mimeographed leaflets. They were how the directors of the local antipoverty board would be chosen, and what would be its composition.

The meeting started at 8 p.m. What followed in the next 3 hours—calculated debate, heated exchanges, charges of divisive language, pleas for unity action—may well typify the hundreds of meetings that will be held across this city.

For here, in Chelsea, at the grassroots, people—with considered judgment by some, snap viewpoints by others, with poise, bravado, shyness—were articulating the views and demands of the poor.

Objective

The objective of the meeting in Public School 11 was the formulation at community level of a structure representative of the poor, which would help coordinate antipoverty programs, and help select representatives to sit on the City's Council Against Poverty. Dozens of similar groups are gearing up the same way. The Chelsea meeting conveyed some of the impact of the program so far on the people it is intended to serve.

First, despite distribution of 15,000 leaflets (some allegedly delivered the day of the meeting), it was a sparse audience, with particularly little representation from middle or higher income families. Two hundred people were deciding on matters that would have some bearing on 60,000 neighbors. (When this was noted there were cheers, "That's fine, fine.")

Second, it quickly became apparent that the voice of the poor intends to be heard, loudly, in pursuit of just demands as laid down in the Economic Opportunity Act. Longtime Chelsea residents who argued that they were entitled to share direction because they had once felt poverty were waved aside. A few suggestions of moderation, presented by some who had in fact arranged for this public discussion, were quickly talked down.

Third, out of all came the evidence that, with responsible assistance, a community can organize such a meeting get lower income people to attend, and the poor can, indeed, speak effectively for themselves.

There are still uncertainties about the Chelsea program, but the result of this meeting Thursday night, were decisions to allow the entire community to vote for two slates, one of the poor and the other a general list, and that two-thirds of the 10-man board membership should be "of the poor."

A rough rule of thumb was laid down that the limits for qualifying as poor are \$3,000 annual income for a single person, \$4,000 for a couple, with \$500 for each dependent. A man got up and said that "everyone is poor today," and asked if anyone present considered himself otherwise. One, a lawyer and member of the planning committee, raised his hand:

The Chelsea meeting showed a long road ahead as the city attempts to broaden its base of "representation of the poor" on the New York City Council Against Poverty. For instance, Chelsea is only one of four neighborhoods in the West Side poverty target area (along with Greenwich Village, Clinton, Lincoln Square). But somehow this entire West Side must elect two representatives to the council against poverty.

Throughout the other 15 target areas there are similar problems, and in some cases tougher ones of rivalries between "umbrella" councils and smaller action teams, between older social agencies and upstart activist programs.

There is antagonism by some at the use of Spanish ("You're in America now, speak English," said a woman. "I admire Puerto Ricans who try to speak English. I don't care about your grammar * * *"). And there is uneasiness among Puerto Ricans that, as Miss Antonio Pantoja, executive director of Aspira, said, they "won't even come out second best, because the Puerto Ricans are citywide in scope, with no majority in any one community." She added: "The Negro is always in the majority."

Centers

There are factions within factions, and the court had to step in to decide who was the legitimate leadership of QUEST (Queens United Educational and Social Teams, Inc.). There is much uncertainty at the grassroots. Said the Reverend George Hardy, president of SEBU (Southeast Bronx United). "The city doesn't want to tell us how to do it [select two representatives], and the community doesn't know how to do it. This is a gigantic task. It won't get off the ground by September."

The city has planned to administer to some areas through so-called community progress centers, which are to be set up in the South Bronx, Williamsburg, Brownsville, West Side, East Harlem, and South Jamaica, but these are viewed with disfavor by some. A professional social worker, George Silcott, executive director of Forest Neighborhood House in the Bronx, said: "A CPC will be superimposed on the community, and the community should be doing the job."

The Office of Economic Opportunity has accepted the New York Council's finding application on condition that the council fulfill its pledge to enlarge its body with 32 representatives of the poor and 10 persons from community action programs. That means one each from Southeast Bronx United, Queens Unlimited Educational and Social Teams, Lower West Side Anti-Poverty Board, Bedford Stuyvesant Youth-in-Action, Puerto Rican Forum, Puerto Rican Community Development Project, South Bronx Neighborhood Orientation Project, Massive Economic Neighborhood Development (MEND), Mobilization for Youth, and Harlem Youth Unlimited-Associated Community Teams (Haryou-ACT).

Dr. Arthur C. Logan, chairman of the Council Against Poverty, said that he hoped to have the 10 new members "within a few weeks," and the 32 additional representatives "within a very few months."

The Office of Economic Opportunity pointedly hoped that the council, as the chief structure that will administer New York's antipoverty program, could comply with the law "within a month—surely no longer than 60 days." There have been two recent public rallies by community groups, full of hard talk against city hall's recalcitrance, and an OEO spokesman noted that action was needed to head off possible "long, hot summer" demonstrations.

The city has laid down guidelines for the elections of "representatives of the poor" in a procedures manual put out by the Anti-Poverty Operations Board. But the city wishes, quite properly, to give full rein to

the communities in the final choice of its delegates.

So confusion, lack of information, antagonism, have seriously hamstringing the seating of "the poor" on the council. In effect, the program is going on, and the people who are supposed to be having a say, aren't. They know it, and they're mad.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF BOOKS DEMANDED

(By Barry Gottshier and Alfonzo Narvaez)

WASHINGTON.—Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, announced yesterday that all agencies, both public and private, receiving Federal antipoverty funds must respond fully to all reasonable requests for information concerning programs and finances.

If these agencies, after being funded by OEO antipoverty grants, it was learned that Mr. Shriver said his office would make this information available under his agency's full-disclosure policy.

Though a spokesman maintained that the full-disclosure clause was standard in all OEO antipoverty grants, it was learned that this statement of policy was attached—along with other special conditions—to New York's \$9.1 million grant because of the continuing refusal of Livingston Wingate, executive director of Haryou ACT, the controversial Harlem antipoverty program, to open his books.

During the last 3 months, Mr. Wingate, a former aid to Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, has been under attack both from within and without his organization for his administration of the multimillion-dollar project.

Charges—coming from some staff members and directors, former employees and residents of the troubled area the program has been created to help—have included political control, padded payrolls, slipshod recordkeeping, shortages in inventory, little progress and mismanagement.

Mr. Wingate has denied these charges orally but, despite pressure from both city and Federal officials, has refused to provide financial records sufficient to refute them.

In announcing the grant, OEO officials made it clear yesterday that approval of the request, which included \$1.2 million for Haryou-ACT, was not to be taken either as refuting or substantiating these charges. / Mr. Shriver maintained that a series of conditions—established to fit local situations—must be met before Haryou-ACT and any of the other New York projects would receive these funds.

Included in these conditions—which must be met within 60 days—are full reports on personnel and accounting methods and, for the first time, a provision that would bar members of a project's nonsalaried board of directors from receiving consulting fees for services related to the projects' programs.

On May 10, in its first report of trouble at Haryou-ACT, the Herald Tribune's New York City in Crisis series pointed out that several members of the Haryou-ACT board were receiving consulting fees from Haryou-ACT and ACT, its sister project.

OEO, which with two other Federal agencies conducted a survey audit of Haryou-ACT's books last month, said it was waiting for the results of a depth audit of the program by Price Waterhouse, a major accounting firm brought in by the Haryou-ACT board.

The results of this audit are expected by the end of the month at which time OEO will give Haryou-ACT 60 to 90 days to put the firm's recommendations into effect.

"We're pretty hard nosed about this," said William Kelly, OEO's assistant director for management. "If there's something wrong—and it's not taken care of—and I don't care if it's Haryou-ACT or Boeing Aircraft, we'll do something about it."

Many of the charges began in June 1964, when Dr. Kenneth Clark, the "father" of the

August 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4271

considers its programs unwise or too expensive.

Speaking in Odessa recently, FISHER warned against the financial plight of the Federal Government * * * brought about by tremendous spending program for those things we do not need.

That is the big problem in America today, and every citizen should ponder the implications of continued spending for things the Nation does not need and cannot afford. Americans surely must realize they must pay for these Federal programs. There still is no such thing as a free lunch. Someone, sometime must pay for it. Yet, there are those—all too many persons and organizations—who continually clamor for something free from Washington.

Congressman FISHER said such citizens "must reckon with the mounting public debt and the inflationary pressures that are being built up."

He further stressed the fact there is no "meaningful plan" to balance the mounting public debt in the foreseeable future.

He said economists warn that deficits account for inflation—"a disguised tax that reduces the purchasing power over everybody's money."

Inflation is a frightening, consuming condition which can bring America to its knees as surely and as effectively as any enemy from without. Americans must wake up to its dangers before it is too late.

Yet, right now, Congress is going all out in approving this and that spending program—all leading to increased public indebtedness, and inflation.

Americans should consider, too, that with a critical situation existing in Vietnam, costs of stepping up the war effort quite naturally will mount rapidly. The extent of war spending, of course, will be tremendous. This is something which cannot be determined for sure at this time. But the powers that be in Washington, backed up by Americans generally, can and should make provisions for it by cutting back on unnecessary spending.

Among the nonessential programs mentioned by the San Angelo Congressman are housing, Federal aid to education, war on poverty, and medicare.

Politics enters into the picture in all too many instances in these and other administration projects. And this is no time for politics.

Congressman FISHER and others like him in Congress need all the help they can get from citizens throughout the land in fighting courageously and tirelessly to keep America strong and free.

A Fool's Paradise**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bureaucratic mess that is obvious in the so-called war on poverty has been so great that it is thus described by all objective observers. The Harvey Tribune, an outstanding suburban publication in south Cook County, Ill., comments in a very timely and precise fashion on phases of the program in its Thursday, July 29, edition, and I include the editorial in the RECORD with my remarks:

A FOOL'S PARADISE

There is still a lot of truth in the homely old adage that the Lord helps him who helps himself.

And it is beginning to look like neither the Lord nor Uncle Sam can do very much with those who are not inclined to help themselves.

That is being evidenced in some of the trial and tribulations being encountered in the anti-poverty program.

We recall reading a recent piece on a situation in Detroit that serves as an example. There officials have been trying to set up a youth employment project and a neighborhood youth corps.

Officials of both groups reportedly canvassed the streets trying to interest dropouts in the programs after the potential candidates failed to make appearances on their own. Despite the official effort the canvass resulted in finding only 30 candidates for a project geared to 70 youths by the youth employment project. The neighborhood youth corps was somewhat more successful yet could line up only 800 out of a hoped-for 1,500.

YEP proposed to pay \$1.25 an hour for a summer training program aimed at putting youths in better-paying full-time jobs after a training period of 15 weeks. Yet, one official quoted a youth he interviewed as saying "you are crazy man, I do not work for that kind of money."

The startled official reportedly observed "these kids are living in a fool's paradise." And that could be. However, it could also be that an end to Government-fostered "something for nothing" philosophy might help bring them and, perhaps their elders, back to the world of reality. Some people are becoming uncomfortably accustomed to getting things the easy way.

*On the Line***EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the July 29, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American. The President made it clear that we intend to honor our pledge to protect freedom in Vietnam. Equally clear is our determination to seek an honorable peace. The President listed 15 efforts on the part of the United States to bring about discussions, all of which have been ignored by the Communists. He has directed Arthur J. Goldberg, our new Ambassador to the U.N., to present a letter to Secretary General U Thant requesting that "all the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to bring peace."

The President has stated our purposes in Vietnam for the world to know. While we will not falter in our commitment to freedom, we will always work toward securing peace.

The editorial follows:

ON THE LINE

President Johnson chose the hardworking atmosphere of a press conference—free from

bombast—for one of his most important pronouncements on Vietnam. It was a good choice, for what the President had to say was serious and calmly purposeful.

The situation has made it necessary, he said, to more than double draft calls from 17,000 to 35,000 a month.

It has become necessary to immediately increase U.S. military strength in Vietnam from 75,000 to 125,000 with more forces to be sent later.

It has become necessary to seek more money, amount unspecified, but in the long run undoubtedly a lot.

It has become necessary to gird for what may be a long war—and the President did not hesitate to call it a war even though there are no battle lines, no clash of armies.

Why are we sending our young men to this lush edge of a peninsula thousands of miles away?

Because we cannot dishonor a pledge to protect freedom that three Presidents have underwritten. Because "if we are driven from Vietnam, no nation can ever again have confidence in our promise or protection." Because "an Asia threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself."

But, the President said, our purpose to stay is no stronger than our purpose to seek an honorable peace. He listed 15 efforts to bring about discussions, all of which the Communists ignored. We are willing to listen to Hanoi's terms provided Hanoi will listen to ours. We are willing that Vietcong guerrillas be represented by Hanoi at a bargaining table.

Finally—and this could be his ace card—the President directed our new U.N. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, as his first act, to present to Secretary General Thant a Presidential letter requesting "all the resources" energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to bring peace."

So there it is, for all the world to study and for the Communists to ponder.

Amistad Dam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 31, 1965, ceremonies were held in Del Rio, Tex., which is in my congressional district, commemorating the first pouring of concrete in the Amistad Dam. The primary function of the Amistad Dam will be flood control and the United States share of the costs—56.2 percent—will total approximately \$78 million. Construction will require the acquisition of nearly 61,000 acres of lands in the United States, the relocation of 14.3 miles of Southern Pacific railroad track, 19 miles of U.S. Highways 90 and 277, two electric transmission systems, and two telephone lines. These acquisitions and relocations are now almost complete. The construction of the dam itself is, today, 19 percent complete and on schedule. It will be about 6½ miles long and its top will extend 254 feet above the riverbed, creating a reservoir for 5,660,000 acre-feet of water. The dam is scheduled for completion in December 1968.

A4272

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 3, 1965

The joint construction of this dam is being carried out under an agreement with Mexico, approved by the Congress on July 7, 1960—Public Law 86-605. Before congressional approval was obtained for this undertaking extensive hearings were held in the House by the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The subcommittee chairman was my very good friend, the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDON, JR., of Alabama. The citizens of both the United States and Mexico who attended these ceremonies were honored and pleased to have that able and distinguished Member of the House make the principal address at this historic event.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the efforts of the local citizens on both the American and Mexican sides of the Rio Grande truly reflect the very spirit of international cooperation and compromise. The joint engineering and other studies carried out by the various agencies of both the American and the Mexican Governments, which preceded the congressional approval, and the continuing collaboration during the present construction, is indicative of the achievements that are possible when nations can negotiate and work within the framework of friendliness and good will.

I believe that the remarks of our colleague, the Honorable ARMISTEAD I. SELDON, JR., bring into focus the advantages derived by nations working together and I commend them to the House:

THE AMISTAD DAM

(Remarks of Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDON, July 31, 1965)

I am extremely pleased that I could accept the cordial invitation to join with you today on this truly memorable occasion.

In this strife-torn world, borders bristle with armament. The Berlin wall and the Iron Curtain sever people with barriers of hatred and suspicion. Egyptian troops fight in Yemen, Indonesian troops in Malaysia, mercenaries in the Congo. Yet we meet here today, not to destroy, but to build; not to erect fortifications, but to inaugurate the construction of a peaceful enterprise destined to advance the welfare of people on two sides of an international frontier.

Mexicans and Americans can be justly proud. Throughout history two questions have persistently troubled relations between neighboring states—territorial disputes and questions of water rights. We have had our share of problems. With a 1,500-mile boundary, this is probably inevitable. But for several decades now, our record on both these potentially explosive issues has been exceptional.

The recent Chamizal agreement presents a heartening example of the determination to seek peaceful and just solutions to thorny territorial disputes. In the field of water distribution and conservation, Mexico and the United States have demonstrated the superb results of negotiations conducted in the spirit of mutual respect and consideration. We have only to recall the bitter dispute raging between Israel and the Arab States over Jordan River waters to realize how productive our own efforts have been. In the Middle East, where fertile land is scarce, the Jordan, if properly utilized, could make deserts bloom. Modern technology

awaits only the decision of men to bury their grievances and recognize that their peoples are the losers so long as destructive political motives are permitted to outweigh human considerations.

Water has ever played a major role in the affairs of mankind. People must have fresh water to drink and water with which to grow their food. Where water is plentiful, communities flourish. Where water is scant, vast regions lie barren and inhospitable. No wonder men have fought ferociously to assure their domains an adequate water supply.

Yet water—so essential to life—can also be a powerful enemy. Throughout history, torrential floods have overflowed riverbanks, inundating crops and sweeping away livestock, houses, and human life. But however treacherous a river might be, where it is vital to existence men simply bury their dead, lament their lost crops and animals, and then set about to rebuild and replant the same hazardous area.

In this region you know well both the blessing and the curse a great river can bring. You have seen parched land turn fertile and productive with sufficient water for irrigation. And you have experienced tragic floods. The memory of the 1954 disaster must still be sharp in your minds. That year the Rio Grande lived up to its Spanish name—Rio Bravo, or fierce river.

Thanks to modern engineering developments, men no longer need to be helpless victims of rampaging water. And thanks to the determination and good will on both sides of the Rio Grande, Mexico and the United States are working together to use those modern techniques for the benefit of their people. The ceremony in which we have participated today marks the ceremonial beginning of a major step toward taming the once indomitable Rio Grande.

As designed, the new Amistad Dam will alleviate the recurrent floods along the 250-mile stretch from the dam site to Falcon Reservoir, affording increased protection to over 200,000 people who reside in Del Rio, Eagle Pass, and Laredo in the United States and in Ciudad Acuna, Piedras Negras, and Nuevo Laredo in Mexico, as well as to the irrigation developments aggregating over 90,000 acres on the two sides of the river. It has been estimated that the safeguards afforded by the dam will save over a million dollars annually in flood damage to property. But none can put a peso or dollar value on the protection the new dam will provide from the loss of life and human suffering.

I am deeply pleased to have played some role in this great achievement in international cooperation. It was my privilege to introduce legislation in the House of Representatives and to serve as floor manager for the bill which authorized U.S. participation in construction of the dam. In that capacity, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have had ample opportunity to observe the constant, cordial, and constructive cooperation in which the Mexican and United States Governments engage. I realize that the commendable collaboration at official levels is made possible, in large measure, because those of you who live along the border—Mexican and American—set the example and the environment in which friendly relations can be conducted. The name "Amistad"—friendship—for the new dam is well chosen.

We all can take pride in the record and be grateful for the beneficial results in accruing to both sides of the border. Let us hope that the Amistad Dam will be but another link in a growing chain of cooperative ventures by means of which Mexicans and Americans alike will grow and prosper.

Supersonic Transport Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 3, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with material I have placed in the Record during the past 2 months, I would like to now invite your attention to an editorial entitled "Flogging With Feathers" by Robert B. Hotz.

Mr. Hotz is presently editor of Aviation Week, and has a rich background in aviation matters, not only as a former major in the U.S. Air Force, but also as a newspaperman and author.

Since the British-French Concord program appears to be in serious difficulty, coupled with the SST program underway in the United States, I commend the following editorial to the attention of the Members of Congress:

FLOGGING WITH FEATHERS

(By Robert Hotz)

The U.S. supersonic transport development program is being flogged to death with feathers. This is the meaning of President Johnson's announcement last week that airframe firms will spend another 18 months in design studies while engine builders will develop test stand demonstrator engines. Since President Johnson said that he was following the recommendations of the special committee headed by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, we can only conclude that this represents another example of the Secretary's by now well-defined propensity for postponing hard decisions under the guise of further study. It is a policy that will waste money in the critical development phase and may easily lose the production jackpot to international competitors.

The Johnson-McNamara decision really means that the critical decision to proceed with building one or more supersonic transport prototypes has been postponed another 18 months. It would be difficult indeed to find any of the industry's engineers or managers associated with this program who believe this additional 18 months of paperwork design studies is really necessary. The current plan will not come to grips with any of the major unsolved technical problems of supersonic transport development and will only pour another \$220 million down the drain in a wasteful holding operation.

There is no question that there are many unsolved technical problems along the development path of an operationally successful supersonic transport. But the solutions to these problems can be found only in the air by flying prototypes. They no longer can be solved effectively on the drawing board and slide rule or in the wind tunnel and on the test stand. These useful tools have served their purpose in the early development phase. But further reliance on them without the hard experience of flying experimental prototypes is a waste of time, money and technical talent.

Funding two engine contractors, General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, with \$50 million apiece to produce demonstrator engines of their divergent design approaches, conveys a false sense of progress. We think both contractors would agree that the critical problems of the supersonic transport engine will not begin to appear until